

THE  
QUARTERLY REVIEW  
OF THE  
EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH.  
JANUARY, 1877.

---

ARTICLE I.

BISHOP BUTLER AND HIS SERMONS.

By Rev. C. A. STORK, D. D., Baltimore, Md.

That very popular writer, the author of "The Titcomb Letters," in one of his eminently practical epistles, makes a plea for new books. To many of us there is something quite appalling in that flood of contemporaneous literature which yearly widens and widens before our doors. Not so to this moralist. Every generation, he lays it down, will read only its own productions: old books grow obsolete; whole literatures become unintelligible; religious veneration it is true spares the Bible, but every book must go down the tide; Shakspeare even is out of joint with our times and should be re-written in a more modern tone: We ought therefore to rejoice at the increasing bulk of modern letters.

The question might be raised as to the matter of fact, whether old books are read or not. We do not believe, for our part, that men are yet agreed to quite cut loose from the past. That, however, we let pass. But this cheerful writer not only proclaims the fact, he also justifies it. Men no longer read Shakspeare and Milton, Bacon and Montaigne, to say nothing of the ranks of those still farther back, and,

says our critic, this is eminently proper. Every age, he lays it down, should have its own literature, which is true enough ; and having secured a literature of its own need concern itself no more about any other, as if literatures were like kedges by which ships warp themselves forward abandoning them as fast as they are reached and passed. To this utilitarian mind a literature is a literature, and one as good as another : why should a man be at the trouble of providing himself with two, any more than it is necessary he should have two houses to live in.

This is what is called utilitarianism, a procedure in sympathy with the spirit of the age and the dictates of common sense. It will be permitted us to say without offence that it is in reality merely provincialism. A man who, from having lived always in one secluded region, has acquired the local accent is said, when he goes into the world, to have the provincial tone. We all know what the provincial accent is. The same process goes on in men's thoughts and sympathies. One who has been shut up in a narrow range of ideas and sympathies, shows a provincial tone of thought. Provincialism is, in a word, the narrow as distinguished from the broad. It is, to be sure, a relative distinction. The villager is provincial by the side of one who has enjoyed the wide opportunities of a town ; the townsman is in turn a provincial to him who lives in the metropolis ; and he in his turn to the cosmopolite. But the relation does not stop here. Every generation taken in respect of the larger life of the world may be said to be provincial. No one age shows every side of thought. The best lack something that others have. So, then, a man who is penetrated with the spirit of his own times, who has ceased to be a provincial as regards place or nation, may yet be provincial in his unacquaintance with other ages. He may be a skilful man of affairs, a keen reasoner, but he is for all that provincial. There is one side of culture that is not to be worked out, nor reasoned out : it comes to a man ; it possesses him. It is the effect produced by viewing life and its questions, art, literature, religion, society, from many points of vision. And there is no other

way of multiplying one's points of vision than by looking through other men's eyes, yielding up our natural habit of thought for the time being and taking the stand of other ages. If I would get the look that life and its problems had to the Roman, I must stand where the Roman stood and look on it through his eyes. And what other way is there for me to get by his side and to see things as they looked to him, but by studying his literature and history, and these, too, as they were to him, not as a modern writer reproduces or describes them. In short there is no other way of knowing how other races and ages of human beings thought and felt but by steeping ourselves in their atmosphere, that is in their history and literature. If we do that, if we take our stand by the Roman and see with his eyes, in so far we escape from our natural provincialism and receive a culture that is wholly unique of its kind. So, in proportion as age after age, through its literature, its art, its religion, its social life is brought home to our familiar apprehension, this broadening process is carried on, and little by little the provincial habit is eradicated. What a foolish thing, then, though it seemed so utilitarian and according to common sense at the first blush, is this writer's easy condemnation of all past literatures as so much old lumber which in their existing forms we bright young moderns have no use for.

But this is going a long way round to get to what, after all, is a very small spot in the great area of human thought. All this rather superfluous demolition of Timothy Titecomb's literary theories is to introduce to our consideration an author who has gone greatly out of fashion; who, in fact, has receded so far from our habit of thought and feeling that to read him is to pass, as it were, into a new world, is to get to the antipodes of our modern fashion of looking at things. I speak of Bishop Butler of the "Analogy."

But is not the author of the Analogy known and read? Surely there is no book on the subjects with which it deals more commonly known: it is even a text-book in all our higher schools. Precisely so: and partly for the very reason that his Analogy is a text-book bethumbed by boys and girls

and made odiously familiar in school-rooms, is Bishop Butler so little an influence, in the religious thought of our day. To make a great work a school-book is rather a doubtful piece of policy: so far as the influence of school-room associations goes, and that practically is a great way, it is to make it a sealed book. How many of us who have thumbed over the first books of the *Iliad* and of the *Aeneid* on the school-benches ever read them in after life; or have any other feeling about Homer and Virgil than that they are immensely tedious? If ever we do come to enjoy them, how long it is before we fairly rub off the pages the dreary association of the days when we pounded out the long lines with grammar and lexicon. One great danger in making the Bible a textbook in our common schools is, that it is vulgarized and made insufferably dull by association with all the tediousness of the school-room.

Now Bishop Butler has fallen a victim to this unhappy effect of association. The *Analogy* is one of the greatest productions of the human intellect. It opened in religious thought a new world. So irreligious a mind even as Huxley speaks of its author with the profoundest respect, and "laments that the bench of Bishops cannot show a man of the calibre of Butler of the 'Analogy,' who, if he were alive, would make short work of much of the current *a priori* 'infidelity.'" But it is to be questioned whether the gain of making our young men and women superficially acquainted with this great writer in their school-days, is not more than counterbalanced by the distaste with which his work is apt to be associated as a school-book. I say nothing here of what I suspect to be the fact, that the "*Analogy* belongs to a range of thinking requiring for its appreciation more maturity of mind than is found in academy or college.

At all events Bishop Butler, whatever his college and female seminary notoriety, is certainly a writer but little read. I suppose the most of us at the mention of his name call up a vague recollection of a dry and repelling treatise on some of the most abstract points in religious philosophy. We

range him in our mental catalogue with those respectable men whom we speak of as "great but dull."

Now this is a great piece of injustice: not specially to the Bishop himself, for he had that disengaged temper from the worries and chagrins of self-consciousness, which takes small account of the valuation men put on one's self or one's works; but it is a great injustice to ourselves. So far is Bishop Butler from being a dry and repelling piece of pure intellectuality, an ingenious and skilful thinking machine, that he is one of the most interesting of men. I maintain that it is not possible to read his writings with any attention, and especially his less known writings, his sermons, his charge to the clergy of Durham, and not feel a strong attraction to the man. The simplicity, the earnestness, the candor, the gentleness, the moderation, the child-like freedom from airs and self-conceits, the genuineness of the man, strike through the pages. You cannot but—I do not say love—but revere and feel drawn to this sincere, profound nature. You say—this is a true man: this man not only has somewhat to say, but in saying it he suffuses his matter with such a color and warmth from his own large nature, that I hardly know which more charms me, his thought or the communication of himself he makes in telling me his thought. It is no small gain to fall upon such a writer, one who makes truth charming by its contact with a noble and sweet personality. Great thinkers we have, and sweet attractive characters. But the thinkers too often are poor in character: they give us their thoughts with no taste of themselves, or with a taste acrid and vapid. And the attractive characters shed their sweetness over thoughts that are of no great value. But a great thinker who at the same time has a large character and impresses his own personality indelibly on his thoughts—there are too few such in the world to pass over any one; surely too few to neglect such an one as Bishop Butler.

The more I study this writer the less account I make of what are considered his faults. Take for instance his style. I suppose we all have some recollections of the awkward sen-

tence, the involved paragraphs, the roundabout way of putting things, in the "Analogy." Sir James Mackintosh says, that no other thinker so great was ever so bad a writer. And certainly no one would call Butler's a graceful or melodious style. But there are two points of view from which style may be judged. We may look at style as a form of art; as the expression of certain thoughts, imagination, sentiments, according to fixed laws of rhythm, perspicuity, force. In this view the character, the personality of the writer go for nothing. If his work is perfect we do not care what *he* is. His style is beautiful as being conformed to certain general principles of art: he personally has nothing to do with it. It would be just as beautiful if an angel brought it down from heaven. So Shakspere's happy line, felicitous thought, choice phrase, are independent, in the effect they produce on us, of any knowledge we have of the writer. He may be the poor, merry player of loose morals, of the Globe theatre; or, for aught we care, he may be Lord Bacon with his gravity and seriousness himself. What is it to us what the man is who wrote Mark Antony's oration over the body of Caesar, or the poetry in *Midsummer Night's Dream*? Now considered from this point of view Bishop Butler's style is bad. It is always slow, often heavy, sometimes awkward and lumpish.

But there is another way of looking at style, viz.: as something inseparable from the writer; as expressive of mood, temper, character. As we read, we read between the lines: in the expression of the thought, in the qualifying touches, the reserves, the abandon, in the rejection of this word, the peculiar turn here, the reservation there, we see inseparably blended with the thought, the mood, the nature of the man who utters the thought. And we pronounce it a charming style because it is so plastic to the nature that uses it. We call it vital, because a living man is given us in it. It has the quality of originality that is inseparable from every frank expression of individual character. A late writer, Pater, happily expresses this effect of style: it is, says he, "the impress of a personal quality, a profound expressiveness, what

the French call *intimite*, by which is meant a subtler sense of originality, the seal on a man's work of what is most inward and peculiar in his moods and manner of apprehension: it is what we call expression carried to its highest intensity of degree." Now this charm we find in Bishop Butler. His style expresses *him*; and the result is it is impossible to separate this great man in one's thought of him from his writings. They are himself: they are transfused with his inmost mood: they are a visible, palpable embodiment of his strong and lofty character.

But, of course, this quality of style can be called charming only in a relative sense. It is charming when it expresses a large and noble and beautiful nature. But if the man is base, the soul petty, the nature acrid, then the expression will be correspondingly base, pefty, acrid. A Swift, a Voltaire—the more intimately they express their own natures, the more hateful the style: "the seal on a man's work of what is most inward and peculiar in his moods and manner of apprehension" would in their case be simply detestable.

Butler's style, then, I find charming, not for itself—though even in itself it not unfrequently has absolutely some high qualities—but for its expressiveness of the man. A large and serious nature full of the gravity that comes from looking habitually out into eternity, with an ardor for truth only equalled by the patience and moderation of his scrutiny of that which offers itself for such, free from all self-consciousness, and genuine, sweet throughout with the wholesomeness of an unselfishness and gentle temper,—the style that lets us in to the prospect of such a character cannot but be charming.

But style, after all, is the least noticeable feature in this great man's work. It would not be worth while to speak of it at all, but as an introduction to the character of the man, and his way of looking at great questions.

I propose, then, to point out some features in Bishop Butler's writings that specially fit them to correct, to balance, to de-provincialize, so to speak, our modern habits of thought.

Let us pass over the "Analogy." It reveals less of the

man than his Sermons: and if it revealed more it would be hardly possible to rub off now the vulgarizing associations with which the school-room has invested it. Of the Sermons delivered during the seven years while Butler was preacher at the Rolls Chapel, fifteen only are published. It is no great bulk of matter; but it may be doubted if so much weighty matter was ever put into a volume of sermons before or since. It is to these discourses, with six other sermons preached upon public occasions, together with the charge delivered to the clergy of the Diocese of Durham, that I would call attention.

The first thing that strikes us in these sermons is the *largeness of tone*. I recognize that this is a vague expression. What, it will be said, is meant by 'largeness' in such a connection? Well, perhaps it is not easy to define: but it may be possible to suggest a meaning. Apart from any sharply defined quality in a work of imagination or intellectual construction, as wit, or brilliancy, or acumen, or profundity, we are sensible of a general atmosphere that belongs to the whole production. The writer, we say to ourselves, looks at things in a small way; he sees only one side; he is a pettifogger; everything is belittled under his treatment: or, on the other hand, we say, he has a broad outlook; he sees things on a great scale; he takes us out into the open air and makes us feel the vastness of the great heavens and earth. This sort of atmosphere may be felt in a work that apparently admits of no great expansion of thought. Homer writes of the squabbles of the Greeks and Trojans and the absurd interferences of a very petty lot of celestials; and yet he has this large tone. It broadens and lifts up one's sense of things to read him. Madame Dacier, his French translator, said that after reading the Iliad everything was magnified: the men she met on the street seemed ten feet high. The largeness is not in the subject, but in the treatment; and that we refer at last to the largeness in the man. Such is the effect produced by Bishop Butler. Whether he writes of Compassion or Self-Deceit, of Resentment or the Love of God, the subject broadens and deepens under his hand. A

certain grandeur invests the thoughts as they arise. The greatness of God, the dignity of man, the sweetness and excellence of piety, the miseries of sin, all appear in a strangely impressive light: the old figures come before us as the figures of life came upon the Greek stage, uplifted, made heroic, with a great carriage that overawes and expands the sensibilities. It is not that we are told anything new; but the old truth in the larger utterance has the wonder and majesty of a fresh revelation.

Take, for instance, the "Wonderful Sermon on Balaam," as Dr. Taylor in his late lectures at Yale rightly calls it. The fact that Balaam deceived himself and put out the light in his own soul is obvious and trite enough; but as we see the secret workings of the prophet's heart unveiled beneath this writer's examination, there is an effect of solemnity and awe from the greatness of the style. The petty devices and small subterfuges of Balaam are no longer petty: we recognize in them types of a vast law of evil. Behind the false prophet we seem to see a vast army of the self-deceived. What a grand and impressive treatment is here:

"In all common ordinary cases we see intuitively at first view what is our duty, what is the honest part. This is the ground of the observation, that the first thought is often the best. In these cases doubt and deliberation is itself dishonesty; as it was in Balaam upon the second message. That which is called considering what is our duty in a particular case, is very often nothing but endeavoring to explain it away. Thus those courses, which, if men would fairly attend to the dictates of their own consciences, they would see to be corruption, excess, oppression, uncharitableness; these are refined upon—things were so and so circumstantiated—great difficulties are raised about fixing bounds and degrees: and thus every moral obligation whatever may be evaded. Here is scope, I say, for an unfair mind to explain away every moral obligation to itself. \* \* \* \* \*

That great numbers are in this way of deceiving themselves is certain. There is scarce a man in the world, who has entirely got over all regards, hopes, and fears, concerning God and a future state; and these apprehensions in the generality, bad as we are, prevail in considerable degrees: yet

men will and can be wicked, with calmness and thought: we see they are. There must therefore be some method of making it sit a little easy upon their minds; which, in the superstitious, is those indulgences and atonements before mentioned, and this self-deceit of another kind in persons of another character. And both these proceed from a certain unfairness of mind, a peculiar inward dishonesty; the direct contrary to that simplicity which our Saviour recommends, under the notion of *becoming little children*, as a necessary qualification for our entering into the kingdom of heaven."

What a horizon suddenly presses out before us as we read those two clauses, "in these cases doubt and deliberation is itself dishonesty,"—and "these proceed from a certain unfairness of mind, a peculiar inward dishonesty; the direct contrary to that simplicity which our Saviour recommends, under the notion of *becoming little children*." Those two so far apart, Balaam the double-minded Midianite, and the guileless children on whom the Saviour laid his hands, are suddenly brought into connection, and between them we see yawning the wide and deep gulf that separates deceit from simplicity.

In the same style, but even nobler, are the two Sermons on the Love of God. Particular passages can give no sense of this noble effect. One must follow the train of the writer's thought, pass with him from topic to topic, and take in the breadth and sweep of meditations, to be made sensible of the greatness of the tone. Take one or two extracts, if only to show the moderation of tone with which the effect of largeness is produced:

Resignation to the will of God is the whole of piety: it includes in it all that is good, and is a source of the most settled quiet and composure of mind. There is the general principle of submission in our nature. Man is not so constituted as to desire things, and be uneasy in the want of them, in proportion to their known value: many other considerations come in to determine the degrees of desire; particularly whether the advantage we take a view of be within the sphere of our rank. Who ever felt uneasiness, upon observing any of the advantages brute creatures have over us? And yet it is plain they have several. It is the same with

respect to creatures of a superior order. \* \* \* Thus is human nature formed to compliance, yielding, submission of temper. We find the principles of it within us; and every one exercises it towards some objects or other; *i. e.* feels it with regard to some persons, and some circumstances. Now this is an excellent foundation of a reasonable and religious resignation. Nature teaches and inclines us to take up with our lot: the consideration, that the course of things is unalterable, hath a tendency to quiet the mind under it, to beget a submission of temper to it. But when we can add, that this unalterable course is appointed and continued by infinite wisdom and goodness; how absolute should be our submission, how entire our trust and dependence!

"This would reconcile us to our condition; prevent all the supernumerary troubles arising from imagination, distant fears, impatience; all uneasiness, except that which necessarily arises from the calamities themselves we may be under. How many of our cares should we by this means be disburdened of! Cares not properly our own, how apt soever they may be to intrude upon us, and we to admit them; the anxieties of expectations, solicitude about success and disappointment, which in truth are none of our concern. How open to every gratification would that mind be, which was clear of these incumbrances!

"Our resignation to the will of God may be said to be perfect, when our will is lost and resolved up into His; when we rest in His will as our End, as being itself most just and right and good. And where is the impossibility of such an affection to what is just and right and good, such a loyalty of heart to the Governor of the Universe, as shall prevail over all sinister indirect desires of our own? Neither is this at bottom anything more than faith and honesty and fairness of mind; in a more enlarged sense indeed, than those words are commonly used. \* \* \* \* \*

Thus we might acquaint ourselves with God and be at peace. This is piety and religion in the strictest sense, considered as an habit of mind: an habitual sense of God's presence with us; being affected towards him, as present, in the manner ner his superior nature requires from such a creature as man: this is to walk with God."

Again:

"Let us then suppose a man entirely disengaged from business and pleasure, sitting down alone and at leisure, to reflect upon himself and his own condition of being. He

would immediately feel that he was by no means complete of himself, but totally insufficient for his own happiness. One may venture to affirm that every man hath felt this, whether he hath again reflected upon it or not. It is feeling this deficiency, that they are unsatisfied with themselves, which makes men look out for assistance from abroad; and which has given rise to various kinds of amusements, altogether needless any otherwise than as they serve to fill up the blank spaces of time, and so hinder their feeling this deficiency and being uneasy with themselves. \* \* \* If it appears that the amusements which men usually pass their time in, are so far from coming up to or answering our notions and desires of happiness, or good, that they are really no more than what they are commonly called, somewhat to pass away the time; *i. e.* somewhat which serves to turn us aside from, and prevent our attending to, this our internal poverty and want; if they serve only, or chiefly, to suspend instead of satisfying our conceptions and desires of happiness; if the want remains, and we have found out little more than barely the means of making it less sensible; then are we still to seek for somewhat to be an adequate supply to it. It is plain that there is a capacity in the nature of man, which neither riches, nor honors, nor sensual gratification, nor anything in this world, can perfectly fill up, or satisfy: there is a deeper and more essential want, than any of these things can be the supply of. Yet surely there is a possibility of somewhat, which may fill up all our capacities of happiness; somewhat in which our souls may find rest; somewhat, which may be to us that satisfying good we are inquiring after. \* \* \* In the coolest way of consideration, without either the heat of fanciful enthusiasm, or the warmth of real devotion, nothing is more certain, than that an infinite Being may himself be, if He pleases, the supply to all the capacities of our nature. All the common enjoyments of life are from the faculties He hath endued us with, and the objects He hath made suitable to them. He may himself be to us infinitely more than all these: He may be to us all that we want. As our understanding can contemplate itself, and our affections be exercised upon themselves by reflection, so may each be employed in the same manner upon any other mind: and since the Supreme Mind, the Author and Cause of all things, is the highest possible object to Himself, He may be an adequate supply to all the faculties of our souls; a subject to our understanding, and an object to our affections."

And again :

"To conclude: Let us suppose a person tired with care and sorrow, and the repetition of vain delight which fill up the round of life; sensible that everything here below in its best estate is altogether vanity. Suppose him to feel that deficiency of human nature, before taken notice of; and to be convinced that God alone was the adequate supply to it. What could be more applicable to a good man in this state of mind; or better express his present wants and distant hopes, his passage through this world as a progress towards a state of perfection, then the following passages in the devotion of the royal prophet? They are plainly in an higher and more proper sense applicable to this, than they could be to anything else. *I have seen an end of all perfection. Whom have I in heaven but Thee? And there is none upon earth that I desire in comparison of Thee. My flesh and my heart faileth: but God is the strength of my heart, and my portion forever. Like as the heart desireth the water-brooks, so longeth my soul after Thee, O God.*" \* \* \* \*

This it seems to me is truly great writing. The sense of amplitude in the thought, of profundity of feeling, of reserve-power in the writer, of the vastness of reach in the subject, that impresses one, is expressed only by the word I have used above;—this is *largeness* of tone. True, there is nothing startling here: very possibly it may all seem tame. It will seem as if so much more might be said; as if a stronger statement were needed,—something more fiery and demonstrative. But it is always so in what is really great: we are astonished to find it so calm. The reticence, the reserve, the refusal to go into superlatives, to give the reins to feeling, all this that is so truly great seems weak and cold. I say it may *seem* so. If so, something of course is to be laid to the account of the isolation of the passage,—we do not see it in its connections; but a great deal more to the fact that our mental palate accustomed to the modern style of intensity, of forced brilliancy, is, so to speak, jaded and insensible to any but the most pungent flavors. Always in reading an author who presumptively is a great writer, if we find him dull we are to ask ourselves,—Is the dullness in him or in me? When a man has listened for a long time to trumpets and cymbals and tom-

toms he will have no ear to speak of for anything moderate.

Now accompanying this largeness of tone in Bishop Butler is a *great moderation*. He is always moderate: there is no straining for effects, no beating the bushes for striking metaphors, no flourish of trumpets, nothing of the blare and blaze that is the mark of our modern style. A little farce has been written lately to satirize the simple faith of this age in the virtues of advertising. One is justified in dealing with such a subject in a satirical way: for it is an extravagantly advertising age. If a man has a capital, say of \$10,000, he expends \$4,000 on his stock and material in business, and the other \$6,000 in blowing trumpets on the corners of the streets, and in placarding dead-walls with puffs of his wares, and his friends look on and approve his sagacity. And this method has been applied not only to business, but to letters, to art, to religion. The art of writing consists now not in furnishing great thoughts for mental quickening, but in advertising handsomely whatever thoughts one may happen to have. To blow trumpets and stick up great blazing placards along one's paragraphs, to catch the crowd and make them stare and wonder, this is the modern conception of style. Like all evils of the character, it grows by going. Every fresh writer must be more brilliant and amazing than the one that preceded him. An author is nothing if not smart: he must make a sensation; fillip the jaded mind with something more witty, more *bizarre* than anything that has gone before. So we plunge from one depth of extravagance to another; from the antitheses of a Macaulay to the grotesques of a Carlyle; from a Beecher to a Talmage. How wearisome our popular writers with their ceaseless strain for the astonishing, the titillating, grow. Now the cure for this lies simply in retracing our steps. We do not need writers that are more bright but, if one may say so, more dull. Nature is full of neutral moderate tints, with here and there at great intervals a high light. The palate when healthy craves low-toned flavors, with only now and then a dish of spice or pungency. And the healthy condition of mind is not one that calls continually for novelties, sensations of a high degree of intensity. The fine style

of this age, with its vivid startling manner, its high colors and dramatizations and personalities, its pungent allusions, and the everlasting story invented or applied to point a moral, is thoroughly unwholesome. In such a crash and whirl, and blare and blaze, it is no longer possible to think calmly, to weigh judiciously, to absorb any great thought. Style now is feverish; it destroys the balance of judgment in writer and reader: everything goes by great oscillations, now to this side, then to that. As one describes it, no man says anything any more, he screams it.

It is healthful, then, I say, to turn to one like Bishop Butler, who writes moderately. What a calming, enlarging, soothing sense of greatness and severity, of vast height above and immeasurable reaches out on every hand, does it give one to read these pages after a diet of our popular writers and speakers. It is like going out under the vault of night and looking up at the stars after watching fire-works at a garden party.

It is worth while to notice how this effect of moderation is produced, how genuine it is; for, after all, if moderation, quietness of tone, once become fashionable, we should have our writers, given over at present to extravagance, learning and practising it as a trick: as there comes in dress now and then a fashion of plainness and sober colors, and all the dandies of both sexes become as Quakerish as turtle-doves. Butler impresses us with moderation and quietness of manner, because he is essentially moderate in his habit of mind. Extravagance, one-sidedness, partizanship in thought, makes extravagance and grotesqueness in style. To see only one side, to give up one's self to all that makes for one's own notion, to shut the eyes to everything that make against it, to leap at conclusions we wish, to make light of difficulties, to insist there is but one way, and that ours,—this is the sure way to violence in manner, to heated rhetoric, to barbaric ornament and paint laid on one's style. In short, to be genuinely moderate one must be reasonable. And it is the charm of Butler that he is so purely, impartially reasonable. If one goes to his author for arguments ready made, for strong points against

the other side, for what will give the victory in discussion, and not for truth,—then he would do better to leave Butler unread. For while he has the greatest weight of thought on moral and religious subjects of any writer, he never drives his point, or argues merely to make his case. It is because he so carefully gives every opposing voice a hearing, considers all arguments, and, as it were, habitually understates his own case, that at last the weight of conviction preponderates so greatly with him. You cannot refuse great weight to the views of a man who has anxiously, dispassionately, fairly, examined all sides, and yet finally, modestly but firmly says, —thus it appears to me; so I see the truth. And that is the impression Butler leaves on his readers. He takes us with him because he leaves nothing unrecognized or unweighed behind him. After all, it is the weight of character in the man that produces this great effect on us.

Let us look at an instance or two of this moderation, and yet weight of utterance. He is speaking on the duty of compassion :

“Thus to relieve the indigent and distressed, to single out the unhappy, from whom can be expected no return either of present entertainment or future service, for the objects of our favors; *to esteem a man’s being friendless as a recommendation; dejection, and incapacity of struggling through the world, as a motive for assisting him;* in a word, to consider these circumstances of disadvantage, which are usually thought a sufficient reason for neglect and overlooking a person, as a motive for helping him forward: this is the course of benevolence which compassion marks out and directs us to: this is that humanity, which is so peculiarly becoming our nature and circumstances in this world.”

Perhaps the reader will wonder what there is in this passage that it should be singled out: it is so quiet. But the force is simply in the thought, the sentiment: it is not an argument; nor an exhortation: neither logic nor passion go with it. But I confess that on reading it for the first time it impressed me with a sense of the nobility and sweetness of the grace of a true compassion, such as few other uninspired writers have ever awakened. That one expression—“to esteem

a man's being friendless as a recommendation,"—seems to me to gather up a whole world of motive and suasion irresistible to make one in love with charity;—and that following one, beginning—"dejection and incapacity."

Perhaps I might leave this as a crucial instance of our author's moderation and yet largeness of utterance. But I will call attention to just another passage of the same sort. It is in the conclusion of the great sermon, "Upon the Ignorance of Man," a discourse that I should be disposed to rank as one of the most religious and inspiring of merely human writings. One ought to keep it by him to read as a tonic when he finds his tone relaxed by the skeptical atmosphere of the day, or by a too keen sense of the difficulties and darknesses that hem in one's path through life. But to the passage—He has dwelt on the truth that knowledge is not our happiness, nor the acquisition of it our real business, further than it is needful to enable us for the duty of life. This he sets forth and urges in a strain that more than any other passage I know of in any language reminds of the loftier and more religious passages of Plato; a strain full of solemn sweetness and inspiration; and then concludes:

"Our province is virtue and religion, life and manners: the science of improving the temper, and making the heart better. This is the field assigned us to cultivate: how much it has lain neglected is indeed astonishing. Virtue is demonstrably the happiness of man: it consists in good action, proceeding from a good principle, temper, or heart. Overt-acts are entirely in our power. What remains is, that we learn to *keep our heart*; to govern and regulate our passions, mind, affection: that so one be free from the impotencies of fear, envy, malice, covetousness, ambition; that we may be clear of these, considered as vices seated in the heart, considered as constituting a general wrong temper; from which general wrong frame of mind, all the mistaken pursuits, and far the greatest part of the unhappiness of life, proceed. He, who shall find out one rule to assist us in this work, would deserve infinitely better of mankind, than all the improvers of other knowledge put together."

How solemn, how lofty; yet how sober. No gorgeous rhetoric, no contortions of style here;—but what weight!

But I have not done yet with the passage quoted before. Let us go back and look at it again. Read it over deliberately; let the force of it come into the mind. Is there any quality besides those of *quietness* and *largeness of tone* that strikes one in it? I think there is. I think almost any one who considers how he is affected by it, will be aware of an impression of what, for want of a better word, we call *sweetness*. The man that wrote that, we feel, is a lovable man. “*To esteem a man being friendless as a recommendation;*” why, to conceive that, to believe it a practicable rule of life, to utter it soberly, not for effect as a fine saying, but as a maxim for daily common use, is of the very essence of sweetness. And now we will speak of this quality in our author.

It is a little difficult for one who has made the acquaintance of Bishop Butler through the tedious hours spent over his “Analogy” in the school-room, to understand how any one can praise him for sweetness. ‘Sweet!’ it will be said—‘Do you call that sweetness? I for my part have found nothing so persistently dry.’ Well, dry often our good Bishop is; but there is dryness and then—there is dryness. There is a dryness as of dust; and there is a dryness, like that of a well-seasoned nut, that is also sweet. At any rate, with the “light” in Bishop Butler there goes always abundant sweetness. What makes sweetness? In one word, temper. A selfish man cannot give sweetness; neither can a proud man; nor a domineering man who loves rule; nor an envious, captious soul. No man that is dominated by one idea will be sweet; neither one who never has leisure, who is in a chronic hurry. All these things spoil the temper, and as laid down above, it is temper that makes sweetness. Now Butler impresses one with that charming quality in all he writes. This quality I will attempt to describe as it diffuses itself through his pages; though I fear I shall have to define it mainly by negatives, by showing what it is not.

He is sweet then, I think, for one thing, by the absence of self-consciousness. After we have read him, and pass in re-

view the general impression, we are aware that we were not struck with any obtrusive sense of his personality; and very delightful that always is. Delightful, but only negative, the decided absence of a bad flavor. We only become aware what an element of charm it is by recalling for the sake of contrast the effect produced by other writers. What is it in so many of our modern fine writers that jars, grates on us? Is it not a glimpse of the writer's vanity? We detect him looking at himself, so to speak, in the glass. Some little personal detail, some turn of the sentence, betrays the chief interest of the author to be fixed, not on this subject, but on the figure he is cutting, the fine thing he is saying. This is a favorite vice of our age. A hundred years ago hardly anybody was self-conscious: now, whatever else our writers may or may not be, they are all as disagreeably conscious of themselves as if they lived in Horace's famous room that was lined with mirrors, and could not open their eyes without seeing themselves in some posture. Some tastes, I believe, like this self-contemplation in a writer. In the infinite possibilities of private appetites acquirable for all sorts of monstrous flavors, there is no telling what some palates will not like; but all such introspection and consciousness of one's fine phrases and happy thoughts, is destructive of anything like sweetness. I do not know why unless because it gives one an impression of insincerity, frivolity, in the writer. We go to him for a serious utterance, and in the middle of his speech he stops to make a grimace, to display his rhetorical skill, to call attention, by some turn or other, to his profundity or acumen; and there is an end of all sweetness. Now Bishop Butler never makes a grimace, never looks at himself in the glass, never is anything but seriously and unaffectedly absorbed in what he has to say.

Another feature that makes for sweetness in Butler is his freedom from any tone of contempt. He never puts on airs of superiority, or sneers. And yet he is no mushy optimist to whom all character, good or bad, is the same. He is not devoid of humor and a fine sense of the ludicrous and absurd, and even of the contemptible, in character; only there is that

large sense of things, ever predominant in his nature, which drowns contempt in pity at the spectacle of human baseness. Take for a specimen of fine irony this passage from a sermon on the "Government of the Tongue." Here is a contemptible fault exposed and condemned, and yet with a noble charity and dignity that makes us feel how lovable and sweet a nature may be even in condemnation :

"The Wise Man observes that *there is a time to speak, and a time to keep silence.* One meets with people in the world, who seem never to have made the last of these observations. And yet these great talkers do not at all speak from their having anything to say, as every sentence shows, but only from their inclination to be talking. Their conversation is merely an exercise of the tongue: no other human faculty has any share in it. It is strange these persons can help reflecting, that unless they have in truth a superior capacity, and are in an extraordinary manner furnished for conversation; if they are entertaining, it is at their own expense. Is it possible, that it should never come into people's thought, to suspect, whether or no it be to their advantage to shew so very much of themselves? \* \* \* \* And if we consider conversation as an entertainment, as somewhat to unbend the mind; as a diversion from the cares, the business, and the sorrows of life; it is of the very nature of it, that the discourse be mutual. This, I say, is implied in the very notion of what we distinguish by conversation, or being in company. Attention to the continued discourse of one alone grows more painful often, than the cares and business we come to be diverted from. He therefore who imposes this upon us is guilty of a double offence; arbitrarily enjoining silence upon all the rest, and likewise obliging them to this painful attention."

On the whole, he leaves on us the impression that it is distasteful to him to have to find fault. He approaches the baser side of human nature with reluctance; he condemns with sadness; leaves off as quickly as possible. He has no turn for satire. He is devoid utterly of the instinct for finding the weak places, the sore spots in human nature. Satirists there must be, and fault-finders, critics and all that tribe; and abundantly useful they are. They help to sweeten the world, but they are not sweet themselves. The business of fault-finding is at best the business of second-class natures.

The Law is less than the Gospel: Moses is inferior to Christ. Even when the condemnation is right and necessary, and pronounced in the spirit of sorrowful justice, it is the less noble function. What shall we say then of those writers whose whole stock in trade is the evil and malodorous things of life; who are always pulling down, never building up; and who are never so happy and witty, and full of fire and enthusiasm, as when lashing something or somebody. It is one thing to be glad that evil is punished, and another thing to delight in the infliction of the punishment. If we bear that in mind, it is easy to understand how it is that many preachers and popular writers, who say the truest things, and are busy lashing only those that deserve the severest scourging, are among the most odious of writers. They have no sweetness; only the most opposite quality.

One more negative feature: Butler is free from anything like partizanship; and how attractive a quality that is. We all know writers who think just as we do, whose convictions and conclusions are identically ours, but whose advocacy of the common cause is simply detestable. They are our allies; but,—defend us from such allies! And then there are antagonists who by their fairness, their frankness, their generosity, draw us to them though we fight against their conclusions. I am sure there are writers in the other camp from myself whose company I find a great deal sweeter and more wholesome than some in our own. Light does not necessarily make a man sweet: it is the way he holds it, maintains it, imparts it, that constitutes sweetness. For sweetness is, after all, from the temper. Making truth a private property of our own; treating all attacks on it as a personal affront; fighting for it as if the great end were to get the victory, and not to have the truth still more clearly the truth;—all this is partizanship and hateful. One must read through Bishop Butler's writings to feel how impossible it is for him to be a partizan. With him you feel yourself after awhile perfectly safe: if he is against you, he will state your case more fairly than you would yourself; if he thinks with you, he will not let you glide over any difficulty too easily. And when he

has come to a conclusion, it is not *his* victory: he has no more interest in arriving at it than any one else, for it is only the truth he desires; and that is the interest of every man. There is a passage in the conclusion of his sermon on "Balaam" that expresses this solemn candor. It puts as much of the whole man into one paragraph as could be:

"Things and actions are what they are, and the consequences of them will be what they will be: why then should we desire to be deceived."

What a vivid sense of the reality of things, of the folly of tricks and attempts to smooth things over in this universe, is here. It seems to me that out of such largeness of soul, such freedom from the small twists and cross-grained strains that beset human nature, sweetness distils naturally.

On thinking over the effect this great writer produces on me, I am not quite satisfied with the explanation of what we have agreed to call sweetness given above. I suspect I have overlooked one element, the most potent of all, a positive element: for though one may come near describing what sweetness is by negatives, by showing that is not this nor that, it after all has a positive quality, a substantial something in it that affects the mind with a unique, individual effect. When I look about for one word to express this quality I find nothing better than this—*generosity*. There is in these writings a certain trustfulness, an absence of suspicion, an expectation in the mind of the writer of meeting a response to the noblest and loftiest thoughts. Look through his sermons, through all his writings, and you will not find a word that appeals to the lower part of man, no bitterness, no cynicism, no little digs at opponents of the writers views. He does not approach his readers as if they were at bottom base, and therefore to be suspected, and held at arms' length, and played upon in their meeker passions. He is noble himself and he believes in our nobility; at any rate he will believe in it until we show him irresistibly that he is mistaken.

Is it irreverent to say that in this we are reminded of a

likeness to the Great Teacher? When He came the common people heard Him gladly. Even vile and common natures vibrated responsive to His touch. Men felt themselves better in His presence: they were better. His charity, His generosity, His clear-sightedness that recognized under all layers of sinful habit and feeling a vein of sensibility to truth, a root of conscience that could make the owner feel he was wrong and aspire to be right,—these moved the common people. He created, as it were, nobility and better possibilities in a man by crediting him with them: see, for instance, his treatment of Zaccheus. This subtle element of influence Christianity, wherever it actuates men and women in their conduct towards their fellows, still exerts, and exerts with ever increasing power. Its exhibition of love and confidence towards men, born as it is of God's love and confidence, touches a spring of hope in the race. But I am going out of the way. What I would impress is, that there is this noble tone of confidence, of appeal to something high and good in his audience, in Bishop Butler. He arouses self-respect; he makes us long to be as good, as reasonable, as noble, as he takes us to be. He draws a picture of what it is reasonable, what it is worthy of a man to be and do, and then he leaves it before us; as if to say,—You are a man; you recognize what is right; you have a conscience, a heart: is not this true; is it not what you should practice?—And then, if we have not practised it, a burning shame seems to spring up in us that we are not as noble as he took us to be.

Now I know this is not the received method of awakening a sense of wrong and a longing for something better. It is generally believed that one must be plied with all kinds of motives of a baser sort, fear, and pride, and overwrought appeals to passionate sensibilities; and that, too, is true. Man is an almost infinitely complex being: there are moods and stages of barrenness and degradation that need the use of what really seem vile instruments to cut into his nature, the sharp edge of fear, the corrosive of shame, the fiery stimulants passion and pathos,—even bathos. Whole classes of men are too far down in the slough for any such fine tones

as those of Bishop Butler ever to reach them. Every one of us has a vein of baseness in him that at times seems to impregnate all the rest of character, and put him out of affinity with the noble methods of this author. But there are chords in men's natures that do respond to the noble treatment; and there are passages of Butler's discourses that make one's whole being rise up and do homage to goodness, rise up with a fresh inspiration of love to God; passages that purify and sweeten the whole circuit of one's nature.

Take such a passage as this:

"But since in many cases it is very much in our power to alleviate the miseries of each other; and benevolence, though natural in man to man, yet is in a very low degree kept down by interest and competitions; and men, for the most part, are so engaged in the business and pleasures of the world, as to overlook and turn away from objects of misery; which are plainly considered as interruptions to them in their way as intruders upon their business, their gayety and mirth: compassion is an advocate within us in their behalf, to gain the unhappy admittance and access, to make their ease attended to. \* \* \* Pain and sorrow and misery have a right to our assistance: compassion puts us in mind of the debt, and that we owe it to ourselves as well as to the distressed. For, to endeavor to get rid of the sorrow of compassion by turning from the wretched, when yet it is in our power to relieve them, is as unnatural, as to endeavor to get rid of the pain of hunger by keeping from the sight of food."

At that sentence, "For, to endeavor to get rid of the sorrow of compassion," etc., one feels a revolt of his whole being from the hardness and indifference we so often suffer ourselves in towards the misery of others. It is as if an angel had suddenly set a mirror before us and showed how hideous is the face of an uncompassionate soul. And yet there is no strong language here; no hysterics of denunciation; no scorn; no threatening of damnation. It is the effect of a noble nature looking on us out of its pure and heavenly eyes of truth, and speaking to us of evil and sin, with a winning confidence, that we can have no affinity for them. The strongest impulse to abhor evil comes from the confidence some noble and pure

soul has in us, that we share its revolt from sin and baseness. And that, I take it, is one secret of the penetrating, suasive power this great writer exerts. So we come, after all, to the somewhat ordinary conclusion; that it is pure and lofty goodness that makes sweetness, and that Bishop Butler is sweet because he is so pure and good.

I have not left myself much space to speak of the solemn tone of reverence that pervades all his writings. Reverence, if by that we mean a conventional use of certain hackneyed expressions of awe at God's greatness and power and justice and the like, is nothing uncommon. But the real sentiment, pervasive, moulding the character, shaping the thoughts, modulating the utterance, is rare enough. Not in the older writers: they all have it: it belongs to their age: they were born into it; so to say, steeped in it. Whatever else might or might not be essential to religion, the first thing in their view was a reverent attitude of the soul towards God and all that belonged to Him. But we have changed all that. It has been said in commendation of one of the greatest of living preachers, that he speaks of and prays to the Divine Being as though He were a man around the corner. Bishop Butler never speaks of God as though He were a man around the corner: he never speaks of Him, indeed, as though He were an intimate friend, if by that is meant a person of whom one is at liberty to say whatever comes into one's head. Though to do that even, would hardly be a liberty in Butler's case, for it would never come into his head to think of God, what it seems it is religion now to conceive and utter freely concerning God, His purposes, wishes, feelings, government.

I do not mean that we find in his writings any extreme expression of self-depreciation with respect to God; which is sometimes taken to be the meaning of the term reverence. Nor that he lavishes any adulatory panegyries on the Almighty; another style of showing reverence for Him. But that his mind habitually stands in the attitude of deep adoration to the highest; that he never loses sight of the fact that God is past finding out; that it is not reasonable or be-

coming to permit ourselves to speak or think of Him as we do of men. In short, he is for the most part silent as to speculation concerning the Nature, Being, and Government of God, as one stands silent before the majesty of the ocean, or under the canopy of the midnight sky. It is when he turns to practical life, to the exercise of virtue and religion, that he is ready to speak. The best account of a true reverence is given in his own words, in his incomparable sermon on the "Ignorance of Man":

"But it is evident that there is another mark set up for us to aim at; another end appointed us to direct our lives to: an end, which the most knowing may fail of, and the most ignorant arrive at. *The secret things belong unto the Lord our God; but those things which are revealed belong unto us, and to our children forever, that we may do all the words of this law.*" \* \* Other orders of creatures may perhaps be let into the secret counsels of Heaven; and have the designs and methods of Providence, in the creation and government of the world, communicated to them: but this does not belong to our rank or condition. *The fear of the Lord, and to depart from evil,* is the only wisdom which man should aspire after, as his work and business. \* \* Our ignorance, and the little we can know of other things, affords a reason why we should not perplex ourselves about them; but no way invalidates that which is the *conclusion of the whole matter, Fear God and keep His commandments; for this is the whole concern of man.*"

This reverence that is silent before God, that puts its hand upon its mouth, and its mouth in the dust, is characteristic of Bishop Butler. It is not so much what he says of God, nor the manner in which he says it; but rather what he refuses to say: this silence that falls on him when he comes to certain limits; his refusal to pry into what is veiled; his abstinence from pushing doctrines to the extreme, and insisting on making all things about God clear. Take this passage on Heaven and its employments:

"When we speak of things so much above our comprehension, as the employment and happiness of a future state, doubtless it behoves us to speak with all modesty and distrust of ourselves. But the scripture represents the happiness of that state under the notion of *seeing God, seeing Him*

*as He is, knowing as we are known, and seeing face to face.* These words are not general or undetermined, but express a particular determinate happiness. And I will be bold to say, that nothing can account for or come up to these expressions, but only this, that God Himself will be an object to our faculties, that He Himself will be our happiness; as distinguished from the enjoyments of the present state, which seem to arise, not immediately from Him, but from the objects He has adapted to give us delight."

Is this too reserved? Do we ask for more definiteness, particularity? The spirit of reverence says, no: it is a presumption to insist on speaking where God is silent. How strongly this self-restraint contrasts with the methods of multitudes of our modern teachers and preachers. These talk as if they were all prophets and apostles who had been caught up to the seventh Heaven. They know all about it. They know who is there, and what they do, even to the food they eat and the clothes they wear. It is this that is irreverent, this shameless attempt to snatch aside the veil that God has drawn, this prying with childish curiosity into the solemn secrets of the vast unknown, this familiarity with the Divine Nature, as if it were only a slightly magnified human nature, this free handling of sacred things in the light of the market, the shop, and the banking-house, this daubing over the person of God with the commonest clay from the high-way and the ditch, under plea of making religion familiar and real. Real, indeed, we want our religion to be, and real our sense of the Being and overshadowing presence of God; but a reality that is attained by outraging and at last slaying all reverence in the soul, is a reality that will not stay religious long. A reality without reverence, a familiarity with God that drags Him down to our cheap and sordid moments, and makes Him common as our commonest business and pleasure is common, is only profane.

This is a danger of the religion of the day. In escaping from the frigidity of a past age, when religion was frozen up and locked away in mere abstractions and formalities, we have gone over to a style of speech and thought concerning sacred things that is little short of indecent. We grow ac-

customed to everything: it is one of the penalties of wrong practice that one does grow callous to what is shocking; and so one listens unperturbed, even religiously, to sermons, prayers, exhortations, that were it not for the knowledge one has of the speaker's intent, might be taken for blasphemies, or grotesque jokes. Even so good and wise a man as Mr. Moody, the prince of awakening preachers, has fallen into the snare. Think of a prophet, and surely Mr. Moody is a prophet, to be loved and revered as a prophet—think of a prophet telling us that "there is no discount on God's I wills". Now that is plain; it is pungent; it makes men wake up, and rub their hands, and say—This is business; this is to the point—but who in his better moments does not feel that it is a piece of flat irreverence? I do not hesitate to say that if it were left to me to listen to a prophet who habitually talked of God in the odious language of the street and the stock-exchange and the shop,—in short, made God and religion as common, as sordid, as the talk of the shop and the exchange and the street are sordid, or to listen to no prophet,—I would find it more religious to sit in silence, with the Bible alone for speaker. I turn to this grave and reverend soul for relief.

I do not know that all I have been able to say of this great figure will make him seem more attractive to those who are deeply in love with the present fashion in thought. Very possibly his real merits will look to many of us like faults or deficiencies. His largeness some will find vague. His moderation and sweetness, after the sharpness and vehemence of our modern utterance, will very likely seem mere prosiness, tame, sleep-provoking. As for his generosity, it will not be strange if some should stigmatize it as unevangelical; and for his reverence, there is one point of view from which doubtless it will look like luke-warmness and a lack of heart-religion. There are no virtues, I believe, that are not esteemed vices in some latitudes: forbearance our American Indians regard as cowardice; humility the Ancient Greeks called mean-spiritedness; truthfulness the modern Hindoo despises as mere puerility and ignorance of the world; and even among our own communities I understand there are

those who sneer at chastity as the mark of a milk-sop. But wisdom is justified of *all* her children: *i. e.*, in the end, in the long run she is. For the time being she may be pelted with many hard names, and taken even for the stupidest and vilest kind of folly; but at last her day comes.

Bishop Butler may be greatly out of tune with the religion of the day. I think he is. So will many others. Only they will insist it is the Bishop that is off the key; while I maintain it is the age that needs to be tuned up to his pitch. But here and there, one and another falls out of the company, and insists there is something to be mended. And more fall out. And after awhile the day of those who think with Bishop Butler will come. In the meantime we cannot do better than read him again, and imbibe something of his temper and way of looking at the great question of life. Even if we shall never quite return to seeing things as he saw them, yet it will help to enlarge our means of judging what is best for our day, by knowing how life looked to good men in an age quite different.

---

## ARTICLE II.

### THE DENIAL OF THE CUP.

By Rev. V. BOTH, Mobile, Alabama.

“It shall be good to hear the report of one of their own Doctors touching these matters. One Gerardus Lorichius, in a book that he wrote, *De Missa Publica Proroganda*, hath these words:

“‘They be false Catholics,’ saith this man, ‘that are not ashamed by all means to hinder the reformation of the Church. They, to the intent the other kind of the Sacrament may not be restored unto the *lay people*, spare no kind of blasphemies. For they say, that Christ said only unto His *Apostles*, ‘Drink ye all of this.’ But the words of the Canon (of the Mass) be these: ‘Take and eat ye all of this.’ Hence, I beseech them, let them tell me whether they will have these words also only to pertain unto the *Apostles*. Then must the *lay-people* abstain from the other kind of the Bread also. Which thing to say is an heresy, and a pesti-

lent and a detestable blasphemy. Wherefore it followeth, that each of these words was spoken unto the whole Church.

"Thus far Lorichius, an earnest defender of Transubstantiation, of the Pope's supremacy, and of private Mass; lest M. H. should say he were one of Luther's scholars, and so except against him as being a party."\*

Dr. Krauth, however, says:

I. "The Romish abuse of the denial of the Cup applies *not only* to the *laity*, but to the communicant, *whether lay or priestly*. There is *both to priest and people* an exclusion from the Communion in both kinds.

"The facts of the usage in the Roman Catholic Church illustrate what we have asserted.

1. "There is not so properly a denial of the cup to the laity, as such, as a restriction of it to the celebrant in the Mass.

2. "When a priest receives the Viaticum, the Communion on his death-bed, he does not receive the cup.

3. "On Holy Thursday, in each diocese, the bishop celebrates, and the priests receive the Holy Communion only in one kind—they do not receive the cup.

4. "In the Mass of the Presanctified (on Good Friday), the celebrant himself receives only in one kind.

5. "The only occasion on which the Cardinals receive the cup in communing, is when the Pope celebrates on Holy Thursday; and this is done on the ground 'that in the Feast of the Institution of the Blessed Sacrament, *they* on that day represent the chosen disciples.'

6. "The Canons of the Council of Trent, Sess. XXI., Can. II., say: '*Si quis dixerit, sanctam ecclesiam catholicam non justis causis et rationibus adductam fuisse ut laicos ATQUE ETIAM CLERICOS NON CONFICIENTIS sub panis tantummodo specie communicaret, aut in eo errasse: anathema sit.*'

"These facts compel a candid Protestant to admit, that the priest is put by the Roman Catholic Church precisely on the same level as the layman."†

Dr. Krauth has suffered himself to be misled by the same fallacy as an old English controversialist. In order to show that "kings and emperors have no more power than the people hath," he exclaims:

\* Bp. Jewel's Controversy with Harding, pp. 211—2.

† Conservative Reformation, p. 621.

"Shall we say that such kings and emperors have authority to rule the Church, whose sons they are? to be supreme heads over them whom they ought to kneel unto for Absolution?"

Bishop Jewel replied :

"Ye say, and that ye bring in as a special good argument of your side, 'The emperor kneeleth to the priest for Absolution'; *ergo*, The emperor is not the head of the Church. How may a man answer such follies better than with the like folly? The Pope himself by your own decrees is bound to confess his sins, and kneeleth down to a simple priest for Absolution. For your canonists say: 'The Pope is bound to confess his sins to some one priest; and a simple priest may both bind and absolve him.' *Ergo*, by your own conclusion, the Pope is not the head of the Church."

His argument was open to this retort, because he had ignored his own distinction:

"Be the emperor Christian, his place is chief among the lay. The Bishop of Rome, by nature of his bishop's OFFICE, is *not only* always a *Christian man*, but *also* a chief *priest*."

To which Bishop Jewel replied :

"Chrysostom saith: 'The place sanctifieth not the man; but the man sanctifieth the place. Neither doth the chair make the priest; but the priest maketh the chair.' Yet you say, 'The Pope is always, *not only* a Christian man, but *also* a chief priest, by the nature of his office.' Even so your Gloss telleteth you: 'The Pope receiveth his holiness of his chair,' that is to say 'of the nature of his office.' Cardinal Cusanus saith: 'The truth cleaveth fast to the chair, etc. Christ hath nailed His truth to the chair, and not to the person.'"

Wherefore the Bishop adds :

"Indeed, in that the priest doth his OFFICE, so far forth the prince, be he never so mighty, is inferior unto him. But in this respect the prince is inferior not only to the pope or bishop, but also to any other simple priest; and the Pope himself, in this respect, is inferior to his confessor, be he never so poor a priest. So saith your own Doctor Panormitanus: 'The Pope is bound to confess himself; and in that act of confession the priest is above him.'"<sup>\*\*</sup>

\* "Et hoc ideo quia ille in hoc actu est MAJOR PAPA." Defence of the Apology of the Church of England, pp. 674, 990-2, 1008-9-13, 1035-7.

In like manner, Dr. Krauth has ignored his own distinction, and indiscriminately argued from "the same man" *in* and *out of office*. By this distinction, he distinguished (1) between "the same man" considered "as an offerer," and (2) as a person "distinct from an offerer."

1. Dr. Krauth admits, that in his capacity "as an offerer," the denial of the cup does not apply to the priest. He says: "The priestly offerer drinks of the cup." But as such, he is a priest. Therefore, according to Dr. Krauth's own showing, the denial of the cup does not apply to the priest, *as such*.

2. He says, it applies to "the same man," "as distinct from an offerer." But inasmuch as a priest *is* an offerer, a person, "distinct from an offerer," is plainly *no* priest. Likewise, a *confident* is a priest. If so, a *non-confident* is certainly a *non-priest*, or, in other words, a *layman*; for "*layman*," as Dr. Pusey observes, "is a mere *negative* title, meaning one who is *not* a priest."

Thus the denial of the cup, according to Dr. Krauth's own showings, only applies to the laity, *as such*. Such being the case, it is a marvel how he could say: "There is *not* so properly a denial of the cup to the laity, *as such*.

But the fact has escaped his attention, that "the same man" is as truly a *layman*, in one respect, as a priest, in the other. In his *official* or *public* capacity "as an offerer," he is indeed a priest. But in his *unofficial* or *negative* capacity as a *mere* Christian, he is a very *layman* indeed. And as such, "the same man" is no more "the same man," than one of the Siamese Twins is the other.

The Romish Church accordingly treats its members precisely as what they *are*, and never varies in its practice in this respect. Indeed, it sometimes suffers the laity to receive in both kinds; but it never obliges the priest to receive only in one. In the Office for Good Friday there is no "celebrant" at all,\* "and that not without signification of a singular mys-

\*There is no "celebrant" because there is no "celebration." "The Mass of the Presanctified is no Mass at all" (Appleton's Cyclopaedia, XI., p. 262), but simply the action anciently performed by *deacons* in

tery." The signification of this mystery is thus explained by Pope Innocent I.: The celebration of Mass being the *priestly* function, the priests in the Mass always "represent the chosen disciples." But inasmuch as the apostles ran away on Good Friday and *hid* themselves, there is no public exhibitions of a priest, *as such*, on that day.\* No wonder therefore, that "on Good Friday, 'the celebrant' himself receives only in one kind."

"The facts of the usage in the Roman Catholic Church illustrate what we have asserted."

When a flagrant offender is SUSPENDED FROM THE OFFICE OF PRIESTHOOD, he is reduced to "LAY COMMUNION," or Communion in one kind.† For the Canon Law says, Dist. 1. *Ca. Si. Episcopus*:

*"Si episcopus, presbyter, aut diaconus capitale crimen commis-  
erit, aut chartam falsaverit, aut falsum testimonium dixerit; AB  
OFFICII HONORE DEPOSITUS, in monasterium retrudatur: et ibi,  
quamdiu vixerit, laicam tantummodo communionem accipiat."*‡

It is strange that the Romish authority, to whose "scholarship" and "courtesy" we are indebted for this Article of Dr. Krauth, should have overlooked these "facts of the usage in the Roman Catholic Church."

II. In the other part of the argument, the difference between "the same man" in and out of office, is carefully ob-

the absence of priests, by *hermits* in the deserts, and by *men, women, and children* at home. Contr. with Hard., pp. 104—203.

\*Ibd., pp. 245—6. Soames likewise says: "Durand, citing Pope Innocent, makes this typical of the *withdrawal of the apostles from notice* in grief and consternation;" wherefore the altar, also, is stripped of its sheets, because "our Lord was, as at that time, *stripped* of His disciples." Anglo-Saxon Church, p. 313 note 4, p. 341 note 1.

†"Therefore shall you sometime read," says Bishop Cooper, "that certain of the clergy, for punishment, AS IT WERE DEGRADED, were *rejecti in LAICAM COMMUNIONEM*, that is, enjoined to stand with the lay-people at the Communion." Against Private Mass, pp. 158—9. Apology, Art. XXII., 8.

‡Gratian, Dect. P. I. dist. 55. cap 13. Corp. Jur. Canon. Tom. I. col. 191.

served. If we inquire of the Romanists, "Why should the priest in the Mass receive in both kinds any more than the rest of the faithful?" they commonly reply:

"Because the Mass being a sacrifice, in which, by the institution of our Lord, the shedding of His Blood and His Death were to be in a lively manner represented; it is requisite that the priest, who AS THE MINISTER of Christ, offers this sacrifice, should, for the more lively representing of the separation of Christ's Blood from His Body, consecrate and receive in both kinds, as often as he says Mass, whereas at other time neither priest nor bishop, nor the Pope himself, even upon their death-bed, receive any otherwise than the rest of the faithful, *viz.* in one kind only."\*

But this is also stating, that the reception of the cup is not a PRIVILEGE, but rather a FUNCTION, of office; even as Dr. Krauth says:

"The Romish abuse of the denial of the cup applies not only to the laity, but to the *communicant*,† whether lay or priestly. The priestly offerer of the *sacrifice* of the Mass drinks of the cup, in making the *sacrifice*, but when the same man approaches the table as a *communicant*, he receives only the Bread."

Hence he also speaks of "the only occasion on which the cardinals receive the cup on communing," and says:

"There is both to priest and people an exclusion from the *communion* in both kinds—the people never receive the cup, and the priesthood never receive it as *communicants*.

"The facts of the usage in the Roman Catholic Church illustrate what we have asserted. These facts compel a candid Protestant to admit, that simply as a *communicant*, as distinct from an offerer of the *sacrifice*, simply as one who comes

\**Grounds of the Catholic Doctrine*, p. 41.:

†It is true, the apostles received under both kinds at the Last Supper; for, as they were made PRIESTS, they were not only to receive the sacrament, but also to offer this sacrifice, representing His Body slain, and His Blood shed, which cannot be, unless the Eucharist be consecrated in both kinds; and for the same reason the priests now do all consecrate and receive in both kinds, as often as they do what Christ did at His Last Supper; yet there is no priest, though in the most exalted degree, but in PRIVATE communion receives as others do, in one kind.,' *Poor Man's Catechism*, p. 173.

†The *Italics* are his own.

to receive and not, also, to impart a benefit, the priest is put by the Roman Catholic Church precisely on the same level as the layman."

Thus Dr. Krauth asserts, that Romish priests, *as such*, never communicate at all.

As touching "the fact" that the reception of the cup is not a privilege, but rather a function, of the priesthood, Dr. Krauth indeed says:

"As this distinction, though very important, is so little noticed, even by controversialists, and is so little known, as often to excite surprise among intelligent Protestants, the author addressed a note to Prof. George Allen (whose accuracy as a scholar can only be equalled by his courtesy as a gentleman), asking of him for the facts of the usage in the Roman Catholic Church, of which he is a member, which illustrate what we have asserted."

But with one exception, "the facts" thus ascertained, exhibit the action of the priest when "he does *not* receive the cup," and consequently furnish no illustration of the nature of the action when he receives the same. The only statement relative to the action of the priest when he receives the cup, is this:

"There is not so properly a denial of the cup to the laity, as such, as a restriction of it to the celebrant in the Mass."

But as this likewise does not illustrate the nature of the action in question, Dr. Krauth has overlooked "the fact" that he has failed to "illustrate" what he has "asserted."

"This distinction" is a contradiction of terms. It represents the act of offering as being made by receiving, and receiving by offering; and states that an offerer is a receiver, and a receiver an offerer. It is therefore utterly at fault.

1. "In making the sacrifice," the priest not even touches, much less, "drinks of the cup;"\* wherefore the Council of Trent, in its very first canon *de Sacrificio Missae*, anathematizes those who affirm, that the sacrificial act is made by the reception of the Eucharistic Gift.†

\*Golden Manual, Canon of the Mass, pp. 302—7.

†Sess. XXII., Can. I.

2. On the other hand, in the Romish Church, as every where else, communing and receiving are interchangeable terms;\* inasmuch as the one is accomplished by the other, even as the Council of Trent says:

“The priest communicates by sacramental reception of the Eucharist.”†

Thus Dr. Krauth has suffered himself to be misled by the same fallacy as above. The phrase, “The sacrifice of the Mass,” is elliptical, “seeing that the Mass is [also] a communion of the sacrament.”‡ Hence that office is not simply a sacrifice, as distinct from the communion, but rather a combination of both.§ Such being the case, the Council of Trent not only states, that in the Mass, the priest offers sacrifice; but also says: “In the Mass the priest communicates.”|| The celebrant, therefore, is not “simply an offerer, as distinct from a communicant,” but rather both an offerer and also a communicant. And this constitutes the difference between the lay and priestly communicant. For whereas the former is *merely* a communicant, the latter is a communicant and also a *confident*.

But though combined in one and the same office, these acts are as distinct in the Mass as Christ’s sacrifice on the cross and a Protestant communion. In making the sacrifice, the priest does not communicate;¶ and in communing, he does

\*Sess. XXI., Cap. I.

†Sess. XXII., Cap. VI.

‡Angsb. Conf., Art. XXIV., 34.

§Golden Manual, Canon of the Mass, pp. 302—19. The Canon is divided into two parts, sometimes called the Greater and Lesser Canon. The first embraces the action of the sacrifice, and the second, the communion, or sacramental part of the Mass. Ibid., p. 257.

||Sess. XXII., Cap. VI.

¶“For the sacrifice and the receiving are sundry things, as it is also noted in a late Council holden at Toledo in Spain: ‘Certain priests there be that every day offer many sacrifices, and yet in every sacrifice withhold themselves from the communion.’” Contr. with Hard., p. 129. “Some priests,” says Elfric, in his Anglo-Saxon Charge to the “Mass-priests,” “will not receive the Eucharist which they hallow. Now will we tell you how the book saith about them. *Presbiter mis-*

not make the sacrifice.\* As the Council of Trent accordingly says, priests and people, in the latter case, perform the same identical act.† Both *simply* communicate.

This has never been doubted in the least. Only in *solitary* Masses, the *non-ministerial* nature of this action has been said to be affected by "the facts of the usage in the Roman Catholic Church." The charge has accordingly been made, that in these Masses, "the priest communicates or receives the sacrament *for others*," and thus performs a *vicarious* act.

Yet it is but just to say, that no such doctrine is put forth in the symbols of the Romish Church. Wherefore an English controversialist replied to the imputation:

"What you would say, M. Jewel, I wot not: what you say, I will not. Verily we do not communicate, we receive the sacrament for another. Neither hath it ever been taught in the Catholic Church, that the priest receives the sacrament for another. We receive not the sacrament for another, no more than we receive the sacrament of baptism, or the sacrament of penance, or the sacrament of matrimony one for another. Indeed the oblation of the Mass is done for others than for the priest alone which celebrateth it, and that is it you mean, I guess."

Bishop Jewel replied, this was "serving out *quid pro quo*," and says:

"Whereas M. Harding utterly denieth that ever any man in his Church received the sacrament instead of others, as somewhat misliking the open folly of the same, for short trial hereof I remit him both to the very practice of his Mass, and also to the most Catholic Doctros of all his school.

---

*nam celebrans, et non andens sumere sacrificium, accusante conscientia sua, anathema est: The Mass-priest who masseth, and dares not receive the Eucharist, knows himself guilty: he is excommunicated.*" Soames' Anglo-Saxon Church, p. 321.

\*Hence he does not "represent the separation of Christ's Blood from His Body." That is done at the consecration, which Romanists call "the essence of the sacrifice." In the reception, the priest represents "the burial of Christ." Golden Manual, p. 368.

†Sess. XXII., Cap. VI. Hence the priest is subjected to the same discipline as the layman. He must go to Confession, and fast from the midnight before communing. Sess. XIII., Cap. VII.

"In his *Requiem* he singeth thus: 'For whose remembrance the body of Christ is received.' If he can happily devise some veil to shadow this, yet his Doctors be both so plain that they cannot be shifted, and also of so good credit that they may not be refused. Certainly they have been ever more thought to teach the Catholic doctrine of the Church. Gabriel Biel saith thus: 'As the mouth of our material body not only eateth for itself, but also receiveth sustenance for the preservation of all other members, which sustenance is divided throughout the whole body; even so the priest receiveth the sacrament, and the virtue thereof passeth into all the members of the Church, and specially into them that are present at the Mass.' Likewise saith Vincentius de Valencia: 'The whole Christianity is one body knit together by faith and charity and having in it sundry members; and the priest is the mouth of this body. Therefore when the priest receiveth the sacrament, all the members are refreshed.' Again he saith: 'We hearing Mass do communicate or receive the sacrament by the mouth of the priest.' Likewise Dr. Eckius saith: 'The people drinketh spiritually by the mouth of the priest.' These words be plain, and truly reported. Which being true, it must needs appear that M. Harding's avouching the contrary is untrue.

"So Chrysostom saith, the old heretics called *Marcionitae* used to baptize some that were living in the behalf and stead of others that were dead. And from thence it seemeth they that now would be counted Catholics have derived their doctrine in this point. And that M. Harding may the rather believe that such folly hath been used, let him remember that in his Church the bishop, when he createth a reader, giveth him evermore this commission: 'Receive thou power to read the gospel, as well for the quick as for the dead.' Therefore M. Harding, so earnestly denying this, denieth the manifest and known truth, and defaceth the credit of his own Doctors."\*

But precisely what these authorities are alleged for, they do not say. They do not say that the priest receives the sacrament *for* others, but rather, that the whole Church in general, and the attendants at Mass in particular, "spiritually" receive *with* the priest.† By this means the Council of Trent

\*Contr. with Hard., pp. 739—45.

†The Romish doctrine on this point is this: "There is as strict a union and communication between all the parts of the Church, as

makes out that there is no such thing as "private Mass," "inasmuch as the people spiritually communicate therein."\*

This settles the point that the reception of the cup is not a FUNCTION of the priesthood. In the act of receiving, the priest is simply a communicant, as distinct from an offerer, simply one who receives, and not, also, imparts a benefit, and *as such* stands "precisely on the same level as the layman." And yet, for all the identity between priest and people in this respect, the latter are deprived of the cup. The reception of the cup is a PRIVILEGE, and no mean privilege either.

The Romanists indeed say:

"The fruit of this sacrament, which they enjoy that worth-

---

there is between the members of a human body. This union and communion between the members of the church is not confined to the church militant on earth, but extends even to the Church triumphant in heaven; it being the same Church, though in different states. This communion extends even to those souls of the faithful departed, who are in a suffering state, commonly called purgatory. Death, which is only a separation of body and soul, cannot dissolve that mystical union between the members of the Church." Poor Man's Catechism, pp. 72—3.

"And as touching the communion that is to say, the mutual participation of these saints," "the King's Book" says, "ye must understand, that like as all the members in the natural body do naturally communicate each to other the use, commodity, and benefit of all their forces, nutriments, and perfections, insomuch that it lieth not in the power of any man to say that the meat which he putteth into his own mouth shall nourish one particular member of his body and not another; even so whatsoever gifts or treasure is given unto any one member of the holy Church, although the same be given particularly unto one member, and not unto another, yet the fruits and merits thereof shall, by reason of their abiding together in the unity of the Catholic Church, redound unto the common profit, edifying, and increase of all the other members, insomuch that there shall need no man's authority to dispense and distribute the same," or, as "the Bishop's Book" adds, with a tinge of Protestantism, "to apply it unto this member or that, (like as the Bishop of Rome pretended to do by virtue of his pardon)." Henry VIIIth's Formularies of Faith, pp. 58—9, 250—1.

To symbolize this mutual participation of the whole Church in the benefits of the communion, the priest accordingly divides the host into three parts; the first of which, as Durandus says, signifies the saints in heaven, the second, the faithful on earth, and the third, the souls in purgatory. Contr. with Hard., p. 546.

\*Sess. XXII., Cap. VI. The Council, however, has recorded its wish, "that in all Masses, the faithful present would not only communicate by spiritual desire, but also by sacramental reception of the Eucharist." Ibid.

ily receive it, dependeth not of the outward forms of bread and wine, but redoundeth of the virtue of the flesh and blood of Christ. And whereas under either kind whole Christ is verily present, this healthful sacrament is of true Christian people with no less fruit received under one kind than under both. And as this spiritual fruit is not any thing diminished to him that receiveth one kind, so it is not any whit increased to him that receiveth both."

"But granting it were so," says Bishop Jewel, "as certain of late days have grossly imagined, yet notwithstanding the people, taking but one kind only, receiveth injury; as M. Harding may see by Alexander of Hales, and Durandus, and other of his own Doctors. Alexander's words be these: 'Although that order of receiving the sacrament which is under one kind be sufficient, yet the other which is under both kinds is of greater merit.' And immediately after: 'The receiving under both kinds, which order the Lord delivered, is of greater strength, and of greater fulness.' And the same Alexander again saith: 'Whole Christ is not contained under each kind by way of sacrament, but the flesh only under the form of bread, and the blood under the form of wine.\* The like might be reported out of Durandus and others. Here M. Harding's own Doctors confess that the people, receiving under one kind, receiveth not the full sacrament, nor the blood of Christ by way of sacrament; and that their doing therein is of less strength and merit than the doing of the priest."†

III. Now why should this privilege be denied to the laity? Dr. Krauth professed to give the reasons, but has failed so to do. This is one of "the mysteries" of the Romish religion. The Council of Trent indeed says, "*sanctam ecclesiam catholicam JUSTIS causis et rationibus adductam fuisse*;" but what these "just reasons" are, it does not say.

The following are *said* to be the reasons why the laity are denied the cup.

1. Because both kinds are not necessary, seeing (a) "that

\*Concil. Trid., Sess XIII., Cap. iii.

†Contr. with Hard., pp. 294—7. *This* is what has done so much "to intensify the feelings of a Protestant," and not the supposition, as Dr. Krauth asserts, "that there is both to priest and people an exclusion from the communion in both kinds."

under either kind alone, Christ is received whole and entire, and a true Sacrament ;" and (b) that Christ has left it to the liberty of the Church, to dispense either one or both kinds.

2. Because of the danger of spilling the blood of Christ—some laymen having beards, and others being afflicted with palsy.

3. Because laymen would touch the cup.
4. Because the wine might sour.
5. Because wine cannot be obtained in some countries.
6. Because some constitutions can neither endure the taste nor smell of wine.

7. Because the Church must oppose those heretics who deny that Christ is received whole and entire under either kind.

These statements being in part wholly irrelevant, the reasons assigned are, Because the ministration of the cup is neither *necessary* nor *expedient*. But if these be the reasons, why are not the priests likewise deprived of the same ?

8. The Romanists reply, Because there is a command to the contrary, and say : The command concerning the cup is a special charge, given to the Apostles as priests. But this certainly cannot be the *causa impulsiva* of the Romish practice on this behalf; seeing the command was given to the Apostles as *non conficientes* and not as *priests*,\* and "*sanctam ecclesiam catholicam JUSTIS CAUSIS ET RATIONIBUS adductam fuisse ut laicos, atque etiam clericos NON CONFICIENTES, sub panis tantummodo specie communicaret.*"

"Why then should the priest in the Mass receive in both kinds any more than the rest of the faithful ?"

9. We obtain no reply—but simply the old *quid pro quo*, why he should consecrate and offer, and not, why he should receive, in both kinds.\*

\* Wheatly asks, "In what capacity did they receive it ? How did they receive the Bread before the *Hoc facite*, (*Do this*,) as priests, or as laymen ! It is ridiculous to suppose those words change their capacity : though if we should allow they did, yet it would only relate to *consecrating*, and not to receiving." On Common Prayer, p. 307.

\* Contr. with Hard., p. 231. Grounds of the Cath. Doct., pp. 39-43.

The true reasons are these:

1. "When the French king," as Sleidan relates, "who until this day [A. D. 1611] receiveth still in both kinds, had moved his clergy wherefore he might do so more than others, they made him answer, 'For that kings are anointed as well as priests.' Gerso saith that, if laymen should communicate under both kinds as well as priests, *DIGNITAS SACERDOTIS NON ESSET SUPRA DIGNITATEM LAICORUM*: the dignity of the priest should not be above the dignity of laymen."—And Gabriel Biel \* extolleth the priest above our Lady and All-hallows, because he may communicate under both kinds, and they cannot. For this they dare to say without fear or shame: "*Sacerdos est altior regibus, felicior angelis, creator sui Creatoris.*"†

2. "The Council of Basil," says Bishop Jewel, "made no conscience to grant the use of both kinds unto the kingdom of Bohemia; and this Council holden at Trident, upon certain conditions, hath granted the same to other kingdoms and countries; and, were it not they should seem to confess THE CHURCH OF ROME HATH ERRED,‡ they would not doubt to grant the same freely to the whole world."§

\* Melanchthon says in the *Apology*: "Among other reasons for not administering both kinds to the laity, Gabriel assigns this also: 'That there must be a difference between the priests and the laity. And I truly believe that the principal reason for maintaining this doctrine so strenuously at this day, is, that the priesthood may appear holier than the laity.'" Art. XXII., 9.

† Serm. Discip. Venet. 1598. Serm. 111, p. 420. The "*Stella Clericorum*," blasphemously says: "*Sacerdos est creator Creatoris sui: qui creavit vos, dedit vobis creare se: qui creavit vos absque vobis, creatur a vobis medianibus vobis.*" Davent. 1498, fol. B. ii. 2.

‡ "They say: One kind must be adhered to that people may not think the Romish Church doth err." Hoe von Hoenegg, *Evangl. Handb.*, p. 97.

§ Contr. with Hard., pp. 205, 206, 773.

## ARTICLE III.

SEMI-CENTENNIAL NECROLOGICAL ADDRESS TO THE  
ALUMNI OF THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY AT GET-  
TYSBURG, JUNE 27TH, 1875. \*

By Rev. R. WEISER, D. D., of Georgetown, Colorado.

## BRETHREN OF THE SEMINARY ALUMNI :

You have indeed imposed a sad and solemn duty upon me. And I have come a great distance to discharge that duty. Solemn and deeply impressive are the scenes that surround us to-day. Fifty years have fled since our pious fathers planted this Institution, in order to perpetuate and extend the glorious doctrines of the great Reformation on this western continent. And yet, how sad the thought that not one of the founders of this Seminary is here to day to rejoice with us in the success that has crowned their labors! How true it is that "one generation goeth, and another cometh, but the earth abideth forever."

In looking around we see the same red soil, the same old gray rocks—the same old moss-covered trees, the same beautiful vault of heaven spans over our heads, and the same bright stars still throw their trembling light upon this distant earth! But in vain do we look around for the old familiar faces of those who greeted us in our youth. David Jacobs, Drs. Hazelius, Krauth, Baugher, Jacobs and Schmucker, together with one hundred and twenty of our fellow students have left us, and have gone over to the Promised Land. They are not dead, they have only been divested of the habiliments of the flesh, and have put on immortality. They still live in heaven. The old Creed, which we all venerate, says, "I believe in the communion of (the) Saints—as Luther has it, "Die Gemeindschaft Der Heiligen." This teaches that we have fellowship with all the saints of all ages whether they are here

---

\* The publication of this Address was "requested by a number of friends" of the author.

on earth, or in heaven. The dead, who have died in the Lord, are still our brethren: death has not severed our communion. The thoughts that crowd into my mind, when I think of those many dear departed brethren, is "Like the music of Caral sweet but mournful to the soul." If the saints on earth and those in heaven constitute but one communion; and if as Paul teaches, the saints in heaven look down upon the conflicts of the struggling saints on earth; and if as Milton says,

" Millions of spiritual creatures walk the earth  
Unseen, both when we wake, and when we sleep,

is it too great a stretch of the imagination to suppose that those who loved this Seminary when living, will still love it. And may they not mingle their rejoicings with ours to-day? One of our poets has said:

"There is a dreamy presence everywhere,  
As if of spirits passing to and fro,  
We almost hear their voices in the air,  
And feel their balmy pinions touch the brow !  
We feel as if a breath might put aside  
The shadowy curtain of the spirit land,  
Revealing all the loved and glorified,  
That death hath taken from affection's band."

I am to notice the death of our beloved Professors, and one hundred and twenty of our fellow students. For in giving the necrology of our Seminary, it would be unpardonable to omit our beloved Professors. David Jacobs, though not a Prof. in the Seminary, yet as he was the classical teacher of many of the older students, deserves a notice on this occasion. David Jacobs was born in Maryland, and educated at Canonsburg. He was a bright scholar, had a sound mind, but not in a sound body. His intense application sapped the foundations of his health, and by the time he came to Gettysburg, consumption had marked him for its own. In the spring of 1830, he went South for the benefit of his health, but without any favorable result, for, on his way home, he died in Shepherdstown, Va. He was a fine classical scholar, and a most excellent teacher, a man of brilliant talents, and if spared would no

doubt have made his mark in the Church. But he "sparkled, was exhaled, and went to heaven." I recollect distinctly, though forty-six years ago, when a messenger announced his death, and what a gloom it spread over all our hearts.

The next in the order of time who died was Prof. E. L. Hazelius. Dr. Hazelius came into our Church from the Moravians, and brought with him much of the soft gentleness of that refined denomination. He was a most amiable and lovable Christian gentleman. His talents and attainments were quite respectable. He was a good Greek and Hebrew scholar, but we all loved him more for his amiable qualities, and especially for his simple German Gemüthlichkeit, than for his brilliant talents, or his peculiar aptness to impart instruction. Dr. Hazelius came here from Hartwick Seminary, and from here was called to South Carolina, where he labored with success for a number of years, and there died in a good, ripe age, respected and beloved by all who knew him.

The next who died was Dr. C. Philip Krauth. Dr. Krauth was called from Philadelphia in 1833, to preside over the destinies of our infant College, and he did preside over it for a number of years with dignity, and credit to himself, and profit to the institution. He had not, in his youth, enjoyed the advantages of a full collegiate education, but by dint of severe application, and having a superior mind, he more than made up for this deficiency. He was an original and profound thinker, and one of the most extensive readers, I ever knew. He cultivated the whole immense field of German and English theology and literature. His theological attainments were extensive and thorough. He seems to have been one among the first of our American Lutheran divines who had the courage to lay hold of our voluminous Lutheran Theology. But neither the reading of the theology of the sixteenth century, nor the reading of the pseudo-theology of the eighteenth, made him either a bigot, or a rationalist. He was a pious, enlightened, liberal, orthodox Lutheran, strongly inclined to the Pietistic side of religion, after the model of Francke, Sigmund Baumgarten and Seiler. He was an honest, upright, urbane and conscientious Christian gentleman.

He was an earnest, faithful, an excellent preacher, and occupied a high and commanding position in the Lutheran Church. He filled the allotted duties of life with fidelity, and died as he had lived, honored and respected by all who knew him. His name and memory are still cherished in many warm hearts. Whilst we speak of him, his amiable and clasical countenance rises up before us, and we can say with the poet,

“Gently his passing spirit fled,  
Sustained by grace divine;  
Oh may such grace on us be shed,  
And make our end like thine.”

The next in order was Dr. Samuel Strayer Schmucker. Prof. Schmucker was a remarkable man, and occupied, for some twenty-five years, a larger share of public attention than any other man in our Lutheran Church. He occupied this elevated position, not because he was the most talented, or the most learned man in the Church, or because he was the most eloquent preacher, but because he came upon the stage of action at an important juncture in the history of our Church in this country, and because he had the penetration to see, and the genius to avail himself of the opportunity afforded him by the passing events of the Church, to rise into a commanding position. He was the son of one of the most popular preachers of our Church, Dr. J. G. Schmucker of York, Pa., and received the best education our country then afforded. His father was a Pietist of the school of Francke, Muhlenberg, and Helmuth. This I know, because I was brought up under his ministry. Samuel received his training in his father's house, and at Princeton and Andover. It was perhaps a misfortune that this promising young man, who was to occupy so prominent a position in the Church, should receive his theological training in Puritan institutions. Some aver, that this Puritan training biased his mind against the theology of his own Church. But whether it did or not, one thing is certain, it prevented him from wielding the same powerful influence over the whole Lutheran Church, which he did over the greater part of it. His high social position,

his peculiar talents, his learning, his preaching, and teaching and executive abilities, all conspired to make him the leader of the Lutheran Church in America.

Poets, we are told, are not made, but born; the same may be said of successful professors. Schmucker was born a professor. His preaching and writing awakened the attention of the Lutheran public to an extent before unknown in this country. Students from all parts of the Church came flocking to Gettysburg. Through his influence and labors the Lutheran Church became known all over our country. His commanding position, his learning, the urbanity of his manners, his large hearted-liberality, and his social intercourse with the leading divines of other Churches, had a most happy effect upon our Church. He was everywhere looked upon as the great representative man of the Lutheran Church in America. His Lutheran orthodoxy, and especially his Pietism made him obnoxious to the Rationalists in the Pennsylvania and New York Synods, and his broad and liberal American views excited the opposition of a good many European Germans. But nevertheless, he was by all odds for a quarter of a century the most conspicuous and popular man in our Church. His Lutheranism has often been called into question. Well, it is true he was not a Lutheran like Matthias Flacius, Joachim Westphal, Tilemann Heshus, or Pastor Stephan, but rather like Melanchthon, Mosheim, Rheinhard, Sigmund Baumgarten, Francke, Muhlenberg and Helmuth. Like these illustrious Lutherans, he believed more in the practical duties of religion than in a mere dead and lifeless orthodoxy. The greatest theological error of his life, as his enemies aver, was the issuing of the "Definite Platform," or a recension of the Augsburg Confession. I can, with my views of the fallibility of all men in all ages, see no great error in the thing itself. For I consider the men of the nineteenth century quite as competent to make a confession of faith as those of the sixteenth. It is well known that in the latter part of his life he had lost much of his influence. This, however, is not the time to inquire into the reasons of this change.

I should like at some other time to go over the whole ground. Let him rest in peace.

It may not be inappropriate on this occasion to quote the beautiful inscription of St. Paul's Cathedral, in London, in reference to the great architect, Sir Christopher Wren, "Si quaeres monumentum, circumspice." If you seek for a monument of Dr. S. S. Schmucker look around. Look at this Seminary, at that College, and Springfield, Roanoke, Carthage, at the General Synod, at the one hundred thousand of the most pious, liberal, and enlightened Lutherans in the world, and you see his monument. Dr. Schmucker might have adopted the language of Melanchthon in his old days: "From the fierceness of the theologians good Lord deliver us." He might also have adopted a clause from the will of Lord Francis Bacon, "my reputation and writings I bequeath to posterity after some time be passed by."

Having noticed the Professor, let us now attend to our departed fellow students. The first one that died was Benjamin Oehrle. His death took place in 1826, whilst a student in the first class. That class contained fourteen, ten of whom are dead, and only four survive. The youngest of the survivors must now be verging unto three score and ten. There was perhaps but one who was under twenty-one, when that class was formed in 1826. When I came here, in 1828, there were only eighteen theological students here, only three of whom survive. Morris, Graeber and Sharretts had left before I came. Of the twenty brethren, who once constituted the somewhat famous "Brotherhood," of which our younger brethren may have heard, eleven, or more than one-half, are dead, and the survivors, now pretty well stricken in years, are waiting for the command to pass over into the Promised Land, to join those who have gone before.

"Leaves have their time to fall  
And flowers to wither at the north wind's breath,  
And stars to set—but all—  
Thou hast all seasons for thine own, O death!"

I can only name our departed brethren. [During the calling of the death roll the audience rose and stood.] They are

Oehrle, Jacobs, Wingert, L. Eichelberger, Sharretts, Greaver, Heilig, Galloway, Yeager, Finekel, Ulrich, Moser, Scull, Aikman, Keyl, Gottwald, father and son, German, Baugher, Hope, Tabler, Vogler, Hoover, Hursh, Sahm, Leiter, Reese, Haesbert, Ring, Sayford, Bolenius, Daniel and Clemens Miller, Cortez, Samuel and Solomon Oswald, Ritz, Arey, Guenther, Ellinger, Town, Bott, Michael Eyster, Ezra Keller, Theophilus Stork, E. Frey, Naille, Willox, Keiser, Sentman, Muhlenberg Keller, Kunkle, F. R. Anspach, John Heck, Leas, Wadsworth, Sand, McChesney, Bassler, Mosheim Schmucker, Gunn, Hunderdosse, Jacob Shearer, Witt, Linn, Karn, Kopp, Harrison, Rally, Michael Diehl, J. M. Harkey, Lawrence Rizer, Evans, Simon Sherer, Wm. Rödel, D. H. Focht, H. S. Koons, C. F. Diehl, Geitz, Garver, J. M. Eichelberger, Haines, Nitterauer, C. H. Hersh, Ehrehart, Ealy, Kregelo, Merbitz, Baer, Rudolph Deininger, Kemp, Suesserott, Titus, Long, Hoffa, Hughes, Ulery, Berlin, Groh, Lechleider, Croll, Eberling, F. A. Fair, Carnell, and Yeiser.

This is the long sad list of our departed fellow students. With many of the brethren, during our student life, and perhaps also afterwards, we had our little disputes and misunderstandings. But the grave has covered all these trifles—all these squabbles are settled. There is not one of these dear brethren we could not take to our heart. If time would permit, I would freely speak of the talents, and attainments, and labors of many of these dear brethren, and I would have nothing but words of love to say of all. With the poet, we can say—of these our departed fellow students:

“They are not lost, but gone before,  
Secure from every mortal care,  
By sin and sorrow vext no more,  
Eternal happiness they share,  
They are not lost, but gone before.”

Without making any invidious distinctions, I cannot let this opportunity pass without referring to the class of 1836. That class contained three brethren of more than ordinary ability and piety. They were Michael Eyster, Theophilus

Stork, and Ezra Keller. If the glorious achievements of the Old Testament saints are held up to us, by Paul, for our imitation and encouragement, there can be no impropriety in directing your attention to three of the most devoted, talented and useful men that ever left this Seminary.

Michael Eyster was born in York county, Pa. He had a good primary education, and received his classical training in the German Reformed Academy at York, then taught by Dr. Rauch, a man somewhat famous for his extensive attainments. He was a respectable classical scholar. I did not know him when he was a student in the Seminary, but was intimately acquainted with him as a student in the ministry. When he left the Seminary, he did not, as is often the case, leave his studies, but only fairly commenced to study after he entered the ministry. He had a very superior mind, well balanced, and well improved. He was modest and unassuming, and died before his talents and extensive attainments were known in the Church. He excelled as a preacher, and as an expounder of the Holy Scriptures had no superior of his age. He was practical, pointed, eloquent, and impressive. He was a good theologian, well versed in our rich Lutheran theology, but has left no works behind him. I do not know that he ever wrote anything except sermons and letters. He labored with acceptance in Williamsburg, Greencastle, and Greensburg, where he died after laboring in the ministry for some twelve years. His life was written by his intimate friend, Dr. Lane, of Pittsburgh, and if the Doctor has not drawn the lines too heavily, Mr. Eyster was certainly one of the most talented men that ever left this Seminary. I feel it my duty, even at this late day, to bear my testimony to the piety, talents, and attainments of a dear brother, who was but little known in the Church.

Another student of the class of 1836 was Dr. Theophilus Stork. To speak of him in terms of eulogy, would seem to be "like painting the lily, or adding another perfume to the rose." The sweet fragrance of his holy and spotless life has diffused itself through the whole Church! He is on all hands recognized as the pious man of God, the eloquent preacher,

and perhaps the most elegant writer this Seminary has yet produced. His praise is in all the Churches. I knew him as a youth when he first came to Gettysburg, from North Carolina. I also knew him as a brilliant orator, a successful and popular pastor, and an author of high literary attainments; and a more amiable, upright, sincere and pious Christian brother I never knew. His talents were of a superior order, and were carefully cultivated. He spent his whole life in setting forth the attractions of the Cross. Like Paul, he was determined to know nothing but Jesus, and him crucified! He was abundant in his labors both with tongue and pen. As a pastor, an author, a friend, and the head of a family, he was all that could be expected of fallen man. His warmest friends would not obliterate a single line that ever came from his prolific and sanctified pen. True to the instructions in his father's house and in this Seminary, he was strongly inclined to the Pietistic side of Religion. He was a large hearted, liberal Christian, and excluded no true Christian brother from the altars he served, or from the pulpits he occupied. He labored with success in Winchester, Philadelphia, and Baltimore, where many were brought to Christ under his ministry, who will shine as stars in his crown of rejoicing. Dr. Stork did perhaps more than any man in our Church in refining and elevating our Lutheran literature. He being dead yet speaketh, and by his elegant and finished writings, will continue to speak to the Church, as long as there are pious hearts capable of appreciating true experimental religion.

The next of this noble trio was Dr. Ezra Keller, a beloved brother in the Lord. Dr. Keller came from an obscure corner of Middletown Valley, Md., where he had but little opportunity to cultivate his mind or manners. He was like the unshaped marble in the block. The College and Seminary, Phidias like, had to chisel out the man. And the success of these Institutions in his case shows what our literary Institutions can do. Dr. Keller had a severe struggle in making his way to Gettysburg. His father, though a rich farmer, was uneducated, and under the influence of the Uni-

ted Brethren, who, as is well known, forty-five years ago, were opposed to an educated ministry. Ezra was converted under the ministry of Abraham Reek, at that time one of the principal revival preachers of our Church. Mr. Reek urged Ezra Keller with three other young men, viz: David F. Bittle, Lewis Rautzahn and John Gaver to go to Gettysburg. But Ezra's father was opposed to his going. He told him that if he would go and preach among the Brethren, he would give him a horse and one hundred dollars, but if he would go to Gettysburg he would give him nothing, and cut him off in his will. Ezra reasoned with his father, but all to no purpose. He would not yield. But the young man was firm in his convictions of duty, and true to his Saviour, he literally forsook all and followed Christ. His father never recognized him as his son, and I think never spoke to him after he went to Gettysburg. But his mother stood by him, and did all she could for him. In 1841, when Ezra had made his mark as one of the most effective preachers in the Church, I saw his father, and used my influence to have him reconciled to his son. Among other things I told him that the President of the United States might be proud of such a son. But no, he would not yield. Soon after the old man was called off suddenly, and had no time to make his will, so Ezra received his full share of the paternal estate. It was this inheritance that enabled him to build up the College at Springfield.

Dr. Keller labored one year as a Missionary in the West, under the auspices of the Pennsylvania Synod. He then served the church at Taneytown, and afterwards at Hagerstown, with great acceptance. He was a good scholar, a respectable theologian, and a very powerful revival preacher. I have heard many famous preachers in my time, but I never heard one that could move and melt a congregation like him. He was a man of warm gushing piety, and highly emotional. I was with him in Hagerstown during an extensive revival, (for in those days we all believed in revivals), and such appeals as he made to the unconverted, I had never heard before! His heart was filled with the love of Christ. And

although he was a Pietist, and a warm earnest revival preacher, yet at one time we did not consider him exactly orthodox according to our Gettysburg standard, as he believed a little more in the efficacy of the sacraments than the rest of us. But nevertheless we all loved him because of his ardent piety and his burning love for souls. And so we would now love our Lutheran brethren of other wings of the Church, if they manifest the same loving spirit, even if they believe much more in the efficacy of the sacraments.

One word more, these departed brethren were nearly all true to the teachings of this Seminary; only twelve of them repudiated our theology—and seven of those were European Germans—and only five native Americans adopted a different system. Would that we could say as much for those who are still living. Of the four hundred and fifteen surviving students, about sixty, as near as I can come to it, have felt it their duty or their interest to turn their backs on the theology of their Alma Mater. Still leaving three hundred and fifty-five who are true to the teachings of this Seminary. It is doubtful whether any other Seminary can show so large a proportion of true sons. Among those who have gone out from us are some men of splendid talents and high attainments, men who would adorn any Church. We find no fault with them for following the dictates of conscience. They were taught here to think for themselves—the very genius of our Seminary is “prove all things, hold fast that which is good.” It may be a question, however, whether those who have gone out from us, are after all any nearer to the truth as it is in Jesus, than we are.

To you, my younger brethren, I would say: The world is before you. Your success in the ministry will depend, first, upon your piety, and secondly, upon your scriptural knowledge. What others have done, you may also do. Be ye steadfast, always abounding in the work of the Lord. Your labor will not be in vain in the Lord. To my elder brethren, those whose heads like my own are frosted with nearly seventy winters: our race is nearly ended. A few more months or years, and we shall join those who have gone be-

fore. One of the most beautiful and touching incidents in the life of Moses occurred at its close. After the toils and hardships of the long and tedious journey through the wilderness, God led Moses to the top of Pisgah, from whose lofty summit he had a fair view of all the beautiful plains of Jericho, on the other side of Jordan. When he saw with his natural eyes what he had so long seen with an eye of faith, his heart was fired anew with the desire to enter into the Land of Promise. He forgot the prohibition God had laid upon his entering the Land of Canaan, he said, "I beseech thee O! Lord, let me go over into the goodly Land." This, my brethren, should be the desire of our hearts. Our prayer should be:

"Herr Gott, Ich bit durch Christi Blut,  
Machs nur mit meinen ende gut."

---

#### ARTICLE IV.

##### THE ORGANIC STRUCTURE AND PREROGATIVES OF PRIMITIVE AND APOSTOLIC CHURCHES.

By Rev. N. VAN ALSTINE.

The spiritual life of the soul, in due time, will manifest itself externally in the form of Christian graces and worship. And as the soul needs organic functions to exercise its powers and respond to the purpose of its existence on earth, so the spiritual life of Christianity will assume organic form and visible exercises. It will most certainly put on the form of church-life; nor should it be thought strange, that circumstances and the social condition of the people would exert modifications in the organic form of such life. Habits, mode of thought, and educational influences, will, to some extent, modify religious feelings and development. This was the case in the days of primitive Christianity, and also in succeeding ages. To understand this subject, as thoroughly as possible, we should take our point of observation near the Apostolic Churches, breathe its pure atmosphere and write what we see with a single eye. Not only the stream of life

issues from the throne and cross of Christ ; but also the true church in form, attributes and prerogatives.

If the Apostolic Churches were not organized exactly after a model given by Christ, nevertheless, they do not cherish a spirit in conflict with the mind and teachings of Christ. These organized churches enshrine the life and power and glory of Christ's kingdom. When he takes possession of the heart there will be expression of love, worship and activity ; so a real religious church-life will be shown by drawing together congenial souls into fellowship with each other and with God, forming a society with rules and order to promote edifying worship and successful Christian work. Here is the beginning of church-life and the visible machinery of church organization in the gospel dispensation. The great simplicity and unity of purpose do not destroy the wisdom, but rather magnify and beautify the model of the Apostolic Churches. We may safely say, that less machinery, less monarchial and arbitrary power in the Church of God, will not weaken or mar the glory and efficiency of the assemblies of saints. It will ever be true, that some men will aspire and seize the sceptre of power, even if compelled to make havoc of the church. They raise the cry, and call for the crucifixion of all individualism in Christians and in churches.

1. The Jewish Synagogue-worship, to some extent, became the model of all Apostolic Churches.

The word Synagogue not only designates the house, but also the congregation engaged in religious worship. The Synagogue was first erected by the people of Israel in their captivity in Babylon as a substitute for the Temple. The end of the Synagogue toward the city of Jerusalem was the place of the ark containing the law and the direction for prayer. Each Synagogue had a college of elders, the chief was its ruler, who read and expounded the Scriptures and conducted public worship. Each Synagogue possessed the right to elect its own board of presbyters or elders; their office was both expressive of age and dignity, and the right to conduct the worship of the Synagogue. The title bishop was of more

modern date, was especially used by the Apostle Paul to describe the position and work of the pastor in Christian churches organized among the gentiles.

It is also evident, that the special ritual used in the Temple, and the offering of sacrifices, were never introduced into Synagogue-worship, and were never used in the Apostolic churches. With the final destruction of the Temple, the ritual and sacrifices ceased altogether. To all Christian churches, they have no binding force, for they had their fulfilment in Christ. The veil of the Temple, severing the most holy apartment, was rent from top to bottom and thrown open to all true worshippers without the mediation of high-priest. Christ, the great sacrifice, once offered, will continue to be effective unto the end of time.

Christ lived under the religious influence of Synagogue-worship, therefore his religious habits, mode of thought and life were more or less moulded by it. So did the Apostles while they were the associates of the Saviour, during the time of their public ministry; and the early Christians were in the habit of attending and worshipping in Synagogues. There the Scriptures were read and explained every Lord's day, prayers were offered and the people were exhorted. The Apostles preached, proved that he was the long-expected Messiah, and endeavored to persuade them to receive and confess the "Just and Holy One." Since Christ and the Apostles and Primitive Christians engaged so frequently and spent so much time in the service and worship of God in Synagogues, it is not surprising, that much of the mode of worship, the rules and principles of the Synagogue should be carried into the organization of Christian churches. Much was in harmony with each other. Doubtless, it proved a slow work to overcome prejudice, to cut loose from old notions and modes of worship, that might ultimately prove uncongenial to the spirit and liberty of the Gospel, and organize churches outside and distinct from Synagogue assemblies. This certainly was the ultimate design of Christ. It was highly improper to sew a piece of unfulled cloth into an old garment, or put new wine into old bottles. The Apostles, at first,

seemed to believe and acted as though Synagogue-worship would be continued until the era of the Millennium, when a high and better state of religious life would be realized. This idea is manifested in the fact, that the name Synagogue was given to their Christian assemblies. When the Jews gathered themselves together for worship, the reading of the Law and Prophets, they called such *assemblies* Synagogues; so also a Christian congregation convened for worship was called a Synagogue. Paul in addressing the Jews and the people of God, says, "Provoke one another unto love and good works; not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together as the manner of some is; but exhorting one another: and so much the more as ye see the day approaching," (Heb. 10: 24, 25). The word for *assembling* is the same as Synagogue. When the Apostle uses the same word for a Christian assembly, that the Jews did for their house of worship, or congregation, there evidently were some things in common to both. He felt the force of moral obligation, that all Christians should be diligent in improving the means for the attainment of a higher spiritual life and greater holiness, and be qualified to enter and enjoy a better state in the last days. He saw the day approaching, and wished all to be ready for it. The Apostle James uses the same word in the same sense, "For if there come unto your *assembly* a man with a gold ring, in goodly apparel; and there come in also a poor man in vile raiment; and ye have respect to him that wear eth the gay clothing, \* \* are ye not partial in yourselves?" (Jas. 2: 2, 4). The word for *assembly* is the same as Synagogue. As there can be no doubt, that James refers to a church under the Gospel engaged in worship, there must have been a similarity in worship, in the Apostolic churches and the Jewish Synagogue. In every such assembly of pious people there should prevail mutual love and confidence; the spirit of prejudice and partiality must be repudiated among the people of God. There is no real merit in gold and gay clothing, nor necessary demerit in poverty. All have need of humility and righteousness, and only such are highly esteemed in the judgment of God.

The titles of their officers were the same. The elders of the people of Israel exercised the office and held the same relation to the congregation and the worship of the Synagogue as the elders in the Apostolic churches. These were accustomed to read the Holy Scriptures and explain them to the people, lead in prayer and exhort the people to a religious life. All should be earnest and point out the way to heaven; be spent in the work of the ministry. So much alike were the elders of the Synagogue and those of the Primitive Churches in their position and work and mode of worship, that it is said, Pagans called all Christian congregations Jews. There seemed to them no distinct difference in their worship—all were one people.

2. An essential feature in the structure of the Apostolic Churches consisted in their *independency*.

By this we understand that each Primitive Church, when fully organized, was full-orbed, was a complete Church in herself, had the right to exist and the prerogative to enact all laws for government and the edification of her members, responsible only to herself and to Christ, who is head over all. No other Church, or union of Churches possessed the right to override her Council, or nullify her decisions and impose a foreign code of laws in which she had no co-equal right in framing. Each Church had a divine birth, invested with sufficient powers to take care of herself, and to conduct religious worship, in her best judgment, acceptable to God. The right of being is therefore God-given and not of human creation, but inherent in her spiritual life; and her religious growth, vigor and expansion are really dependent on her vital union with Christ. The Apostolic Churches were complete and independent in their mode of existence and the exercise of their prerogatives; not a part, a hundred or one thousandth part of one complete Church, unable to be a Church, to exist and to live, unless they were united together in ecclesiastical union, constituting only one Church, comprising the whole people of God.

But will not the *independency* mar their harmony and bring them into a clanship-strife? We believe that the Apostolic

Churches lived in great harmony and unity of spirit without any external confederation. The unity existing was in heart, confidence, grace and love. They were born of the same Spirit and begotten of the same Father. This union of feeling and purpose comes from above and dwells in the hearts of the people, and is never produced merely by the powers and laws of confederation. This accords with Apostolic teaching, "For as the body is one and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body ; so also is Christ. For by one spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free ; and have all been made to drink into one spirit," (1 Cor. 12 : 12). "Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow citizens with the saints, and of the household of God ; and are built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief-corner stone," (Eph. 2 : 19, 20). "Endeavoring to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace," (4 : 3).

It appears, then, that there can be no question, either of the *independence* or *unity* of the Apostolic Churches. No feeling of alienation or work of strife could enter and mar the love-ness of fraternity in any Church, or between the Churches existing in different localities without sharp rebuke from the Apostles. Neither had any Church, not even the mother Church at Jerusalem, or the Church at Antioch, the right, or arrogated the prerogative, to dictate laws for the existence and government of other Churches. Each local Church, under Christ, possessed the absolute right and qualification to conduct her over religious worship and exercise government for her edification ; and no other Church, or combination of Churches possessed the right, uninvited, to interfere, dictate, enact and enjoin other laws. Each Primitive Church, therefore, had the right to legislate and execute government as seemed most acceptable, only responsible to Christ, who is Chief over all.

These Primitive Churches may have asked and received counsel and advice in cases of emergency, yet this would not necessarily destroy their *independency*. In the multitude of

counsels there may be greater safety. The spirit and right of *independency* do not require bigotry, a headstrong and arrogant feeling of superiority; but they are consistent with humility, meekness and brotherly love. The Primitive Churches did not create a schism in the body of Christ by a practical recognition of the doctrine of ecclesiastical independency; nor yield to the idea of a monarchial confederation by admitting that all Christian Churches constitute but one body in Christ. The human body is one, though composed of many members; so also many Christians compose our Church. All the Apostolic Churches were factors of the one kingdom of Christ. This view alone seems consistent with the character of those Churches which the inspired Apostles planted and trained. The elements of *superiority* and dictation were wanting in constituting and governing these Primitive Churches. Each Church had individual rights—all were co-equal—all were supremely responsible to Christ.

3. The Apostolic Churches held their own *elections*, and in this way proved their *co-equal authority* and *independency*.

The right of suffrage belonged to all the members of each local Church, therefore each Christian society or assembly was a popular republic, and had the exclusive right to elect her officers and teachers, and carry forward her own government to her best interests. At first the Apostles may have done more to regulate and govern the Churches than they did after a process of time, for the spread and development of the Gospel qualified each Church to do her own work and protect her interest. The right to elect the officers and teachers as each Church judged necessary, was exercised on several occasions.

The first instance put on record was that of the election of (a) Matthias to the apostleship to fill the vacancy of Judas, the traitor. This election was one of great importance, not only because of the fact of the election of an Apostle, but also because it was done by the suffrage of the whole Church at Jerusalem, affording a decisive proof of the prerogative and supreme authority of the local Church. If the Apostles had understood the character and constitution of the Primi-

tive Church, that the choice and setting apart of suitable persons to the ministry of the word to be their exclusive prerogative, and that believers organized into a Church had no part in the matter; then the Apostles would not have appealed and submitted the question to the whole Church at Jerusalem. Of this there can be no doubt, for Peter arose and addressed all who were present, saying that Judas, who had been numbered with the twelve, had fallen and rendered vacant the Apostleship, and that therefore it was necessary to fill the vacancy by an election. It is not clearly certain whether even the nomination was made by the Apostle, or mutually by them and the Church. This much is certain, that when the two candidates were before them, the Apostles offered prayer to God for wisdom and guidance in the election. The society of believers proceeded jointly with the Apostles in holding the election and made choice of Matthias to fill the vacancy.

If such an election belonged exclusively to the Apostles, or to the ministry of the Gospel to perpetuate itself, why then did not the Apostles perform this act of electing an Apostle, after the ascension of Christ, in a quiet way by themselves? Why did Peter address the whole Church on this matter and urge the necessity of selecting some one to fill the vacancy. The whole scene disclaims, that the Apostles had the exclusive right to fill the number of the Apostleship; much less the right to fill and perpetuate the ministry of the Gospel. This popular election under the circumstances and for the purpose specified, forcibly proves, that all ecclesiastical rights are *primarily inherent* in the Churches. The ordination by the Apostles was only confirmatory of the result of the proper election.

(b.) The next record we have of an election in the Primitive Church of Christ was for seven deacons.

Some believers became disturbed in their feelings, and were dissatisfied with the daily ministrations to supply the wants of the needy, and they brought complaints before the Apostles. To quiet the mind, to preserve peace and to give greater efficiency to the newly organized Church of Christ,

the Apostles advised the Church to elect persons, wise, discreet and earnestly devoted to serve as deacons. It is not certain by whom, heretofore, these ministrations were made. It is improbable that this service had been done by the Apostles. It is more probable by some native Jews, therefore the Hellenist Jews complained of partiality and injustice to their poor. The Apostles publicly announced, that they had no time for such service, hence their recommendation. The advice of the Apostles was cordially entertained and carried out by holding an election. The whole multitude of the disciples assembled and made choice of seven brethren, who were known to be pious and filled with the Holy Ghost. After the election, these men were inducted into the office of deacons by the Apostles by laying on of hands, and thus accepting and ratifying the action and choice of the whole Church.

We learn that the Primitive Church was invested with the individual right, inherent in her life and existence, to wield the power of self-protection and perpetuation, and was not dependent for this prerogative on other Churches, or the ministry, or a diocesan bishop or Synod. She had the right to hold elections and adopt rules without Apostolic interposition. This method of self-government stands forth clearly and defies all successful controversy. The Apostles might have made a selection of equally good men, honest, wise and faithful; but that was not their business as ministers of Christ, for this right of suffrage belonged exclusively to the members of each society of believers. We shall discover that church-rights were developed one by one as circumstances and occasion required.

As the body of the Church was enlarged and the people of God were scattered abroad, the Apostles went forth preaching the Gospel at large, and were successful in planting Churches in various localities. It would be natural, that fraternal feeling should prevail among all, and mutual confidence. The Church at Jerusalem was the first in existence, it would be natural that she would be regarded as the mother Church among the Jews, and that at Antioch by the Churches gathered from among the Gentiles. The religious prosperity

resulting from the labors of the Apostles, and the multiplication of Churches, required more laborers and aids to the active ministry, therefore more legislation and specific regulations in the Churches, developing a new feature in church affairs.

(c.) The appointment of delegates and assistants was the act of the Church.

The Apostle Paul, the great Missionary among the Gentiles was favored with co-laborers and assistants to cultivate his large field. When the news reached the ears of the Church at Jerusalem of the outpouring of the Spirit and the work of grace at Antioch, she sent Barnabas to visit that city and aid in building up the cause of God. This Church at Antioch became large and influential in a short time; she stood first in growth and activity. By divine command they set apart Paul and Barnabas, for the work of the ministry in other places. From this city and Church went forth most emphatically the work of evangelizing the heathen world. While Paul had the care of many Churches, he stood in need of brethren to accompany him in his travels, aid him to set in order the things in the Churches, to preach the word, to encourage and comfort the people. Among the many co-laborers and assistants of Paul, we mention Barnabas, Silas, Timothy, Titus, Silvanus, Mark, Clemens and Epaphras. These brethren and assistants of Paul were "Messengers of the Churches and the glory of Christ," (2 Cor. 8 : 23). Neander makes this statement in reference to the appointment of Titus and the election of the seven deacons. Paul speaks of Titus, "who was chosen of the Churches to travel" with him, (2 Cor. 8 : 19). Neander says,

"Inasmuch as the Apostles submitted the appointment of deacons to the vote of the Church and that of the delegates who should accompany them in the name of the Churches, we may infer that a similar course was pursued also in the appointment of other officers of the Church."

(d.) The right of suffrage is an element of popular government and each Church has the right to elect her own pastor, teachers and rulers.

Mosheim gives his opinion on this subject in the following language:

"To them (the multitude or people) belonged the appointment of the Bishop, or Presbyters, as well as of the inferior ministers,—with them resided the power of enacting laws, as also of adopting or rejecting whatever might be proposed in the general assemblies, and of expelling and again receiving into communion any depraved or unworthy members."

Why should we discredit the correctness of this principle in the government of the Church, when we admit and defend its soundness in all rightful civil government? We believe in this land, that all persons are equal before the law, and have the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; the right to choose our own rulers and enact law by our own selected agents. Why not in the Church, since conscience and our religious life are of far more value?

(e.) The suppression of the right of suffrage is the destruction of the balance of power between ministers and the people, the extinction of religious liberty, and opening the way for irreligion and error.

If this proposition be true, how intrinsically important, that the rights of the primitive churches should be maintained, their independency, the elements of a religious republic to choose their pastors and rulers and the prerogative to enact such laws and establish such usages as they may deem well calculated to build them up in grace, and holiness. So long as the people hold the right of suffrage they have the power to repel all aggressions on their rights and stand up in self-defence. Ministers are no more at liberty to trample under foot the laity than the latter have the right to degrade the ministry. The right of suffrage is mutual—while this is justly and fraternally exercised all is safe. Every student of ecclesiastical history can not fail to understand, what were the first innovations which marked the degeneracy of the early Christian Church. It was when certain men began to aspire for positions of honor and power superior to others, and when certain Churches, arrogated to themselves the right to control weaker ones. The Church of the city to govern

and direct the business of those of the country. Then we witness the suppression of religious liberty and the opening of the gates of error and irreligion. For these reasons, let every church be jealous of her rights and religious integrity, for all Christians are the Lord's freemen, and should realize that they endanger their liberty by transferring their rights into the hands of others. God has given to them the right of suffrage and to enact laws for their good. Never should Churches allow another body to enact laws for their government or surrender the right to repeal all obnoxious laws. Such an ecclesiastical body was unknown in the Apostolic Churches, and it will be expedient and right for all our Churches, in the present age, to repudiate it.

#### 4. The primitive Churches exercised the right of discipline.

All members were admitted into church-fellowship by the action of the church on profession of faith in Christ, and all errorists and apostates were expelled by the action of the Church. There can be no reasonable doubt that each Church was invested with this right of discipline for her own purity and safety. Each member was responsible to his own Church and not to another society of Christian men. He who was a member of the Church at Jerusalem was not responsible to the Church at Antioch, or subject to her discipline. Each Church, therefore, had only jurisdiction over her own members. The Apostles did not claim and exercise discipline over the members of the Churches, but requested each local Church to attend to this their legitimate duty. They only, when necessary, gave the proper instructions to guide all the Churches in their action of discipline.

We have several instances on record to guide our opinion on this subject. The instruction of Christ given to his disciples contains the seeds of all equitable discipline in the Church, (Matt. 18 : 15—17). It is not improbable that this rule was familiar to all, for it prevailed in the government of Jewish Synagogues, and the sanction of it by Christ, transferred it, at least prospectively, to all Christian Churches. It was only when all efforts failed to reform, that offending

persons must be excluded from Christian fellowship. Faithfulness and a forgiving spirit should be largely and earnestly cultivated, so as, if possible, to insure success in the desired reformation.

Paul has given us one instance of church-discipline in detail, and from it we can form a clear and full conception of the performance of this duty. In the Church at Corinth, one of her members was guilty of a gross crime. The Apostle became acquainted with the fact, and in his second Epistle he gives to the Church a full and clear expression of his feelings and views on the subject and their duty in the case. Those who are without the Church we should leave for God to judge; but those who are members, it is the duty of the collective Church to judge and discipline. When the directions of Christ do not prove successful in the reformation of the apostate, then they should be excommunicated and thus delivered over to the kingdom of Satan, to reap the fearful penalty of expulsion, hoping that this, as a dernier resort, will lead them to repentance, reformation and salvation.

The Apostle informed his brethren in the Corinthian Church, that he regarded such discipline a righteous act; he would approve of it; that his spirit, all his feelings, and the deep emotions of his heart, would be with them to comfort and encourage them; but they must be careful not to lose sight of the chief end of all church-discipline, to aim at the purity and strength of the Church, and reformation of the excommunicated—win them back, if possible, to the Church and to Christ.

There are several leading thoughts which should not be overlooked nor be forgotten. The right for each Church to exercise discipline—the duty and motive to exert a moral influence to reform the offender and honor religion—each Church is best qualified to conduct a fair and candid investigation and render a just decision, and no appeal from that decision—the discipline of the Church relieves the pastor from many unwelcome responsibilities in *admitting* or *expelling* members—all healthy discipline will contribute to the peace and efficiency of the Church, to save souls and to honor Christ.

This whole subject is worthy of candid research and thorough study. It involves principles of vital interests to the practical character and, we think, to the efficiency of the Churches of Christ. If this subject underlies the status, the life, and the essential rights and liberty of each Church, then all should stand up for its defence. Understand the theory and reduce it, at all hazard, to a legitimate practice and honest conformity.

---

## ARTICLE V.

### OUR PRESENT KNOWLEDGE OF THE SUN.

By Rev. PHILIP M. BIKLÉ, A. M., Professor of Physics and Astronomy in Pennsylvania College, Gettysburg, Pa.

Of the many celestial bodies that claim our attention and study, there are some that have points of special distinction. Possessing many features in common with the rest, they yet hold in other respects a prominence which confers upon them additional interest, and, in many cases, large additional value.

In examining the expanse of a cloudless midnight sky, the stars are apparently all alike save in brightness or possibly, here and there, in color; and yet among the vast brotherhood is one which, though not the brightest nor the most beautiful, transcends them all in the importance of its position. Now within a degree and a half of the place in the heavens to which one end of the earth's axis points, Polaris has been for centuries past and will be for centuries to come a faithful guide to the mariner and an ever helpful assistant to the astronomer. The earth's own satellite, though among the smallest of the heavenly bodies, is large in interest and importance. Its mellow, silver light and ever-recurring cycle of phases; its nearness to the earth, and preponderating influence in causing the oceanic tides; its help in finding the longitude of a place by the occultation of stars; its agency in causing the phenomena of solar eclipses; its rugged and manifestly desolate character, all combine to mark it, apart from its difference in appearance from the other bodies, as an object of special interest.

Of the fixed stars Sirius leads them all in brightness. Of the planets Jupiter is the prince in size. Saturn ranks above the rest in having the greatest number of attendant satellites, and stands alone in being encircled by several rings. Venus the beautiful morning and evening star is noted for her surpassing brilliancy at times, and for furnishing, by her transits across the Sun's disk, the most reliable method of obtaining the solar parallax. Neptune has the distinction of being the most distant of the known planets, thus standing as the outermost sentinel of the solar system.

Thus one heavenly body is found marked by this special feature and another by that, but there is one other which has a deeper interest and a more far-reaching influence than any of the rest. That one is the Sun.

To the earth's inhabitants the Sun is pre-eminent among physical objects not only on account of his own wonderful nature in itself considered, but also on account of the intimate relation he bears to every phase of terrestrial activity. The last expression is not too sweeping. It is only necessary to recall hastily some of the well known movements and changes constantly going on upon the earth to make the truth of it apparent.

It is from influences proceeding from the Sun that we have the winds, the storms, the clouds, the electric phenomena of the atmosphere. By his heat are produced the waves, the currents, the constant evaporation of the waters of the ocean. He has a share in the swelling tides. It is his vivifying power that enables vegetation to draw sustenance from inorganic matter and clothe itself with leaf and blossom and fruit. This is appropriated by men and animals, and every movement made, every act performed, every sound uttered is due, under divine power, to the transformation of solar heat through the mysterious processes of vegetable and animal life into vital force. The immense supply of coal, stored away long ago, obtained from the Sun the heat it is capable of giving to convert water into the steam that drives the machinery of our mills and factories. Everywhere we turn, indeed, there is to be found evidence of the potent influence of solar radiation.

If this heating power alone were taken away, allowing him to retain all the others, the earth would soon become a barren waste, and its inhabitants perish.

In view of all this, combined with the fact that he is the centre of our system, it is but reasonable that the Sun should be an object of supreme interest. It is our purpose to give in as brief space as possible the chief facts known at present about him, and to state some of the theories on points about which there is now no positive knowledge.

#### THE DISTANCE AND SIZE OF THE SUN.

The distance of a heavenly body is the first thing to be ascertained about it; for that must be known before there can be any determination of its volume or mass, and without these our knowledge would be limited indeed. The distance of the Sun is necessary not only for the reason given above, but also because it is essential in ascertaining the distances of the other celestial bodies, the moon excepted. An increase or diminution of this distance would have a corresponding effect upon the others, for it is the unit of measure and carries with it the influence of any other standard. It is *the* problem of Astronomy, and to its solution the devotees of the science have directed their best efforts.

In December, 1874, there occurred one of those rare events upon which astronomers largely rely for ascertaining the distance of the Sun. That event was the transit of the planet, Venus, across the solar disk. It was the first one since 1769. There will be another in December, 1882, visible along the Atlantic coast of the United States, but the next after that will not occur before the year 2004. All the leading nations of the world equipped and sent out expeditions, (the United States Government sending eight) to observe the transit of 1874. The immediate object aimed at was to secure a more correct value for the Sun's parallax. Without giving any technical definition of parallax, the present case may be plainly stated by saying, that it is the angle formed by the two lines drawn from the Sun to the extremities of the earth's radius, that radius forming a right angle with the line drawn to the centre of the earth. That angle is very

small. Some conception of its minuteness may be formed from some illustration like the following: Take two perfectly straight iron bars *one-third of a mile* in length, place them side by side in contact, then separate them at one end by just *one inch*; then the angle formed at the other end will be somewhat greater than the solar parallax, and the distance apart of one inch will represent a little more than the earth's semidiameter.

It is apparent from this, that a very slight error in observation or calculation will very decidedly affect the general result. In fact, a variation of only the *one-tenth of a second* from the value of the Sun's parallax would make a difference of more than *one million miles* in the Sun's distance. The true distance of the Sun is, in all probability, between ninety-one and a half millions and ninety-two millions of miles. This is the *mean* distance, however, the difference between the maximum and minimum being about three millions of miles. The results of the observations that will be made in 1882 will be combined with those made in 1874, and from the two sets the margin of error will certainly be much reduced.

It is impossible to have a true comprehension of such an enormous distance as has been named. In dealing with *millions* the mind is bewildered, and can arrive at nothing satisfactory except by putting things in such shape as to involve numbers that are more readily apprehended. Something may be gained by an effort of that kind in this case. The mind has, for instance, a pretty fair conception of the velocity of a railroad train going at the rate of thirty miles per hour. Now if something were started on its way in a direct line towards the Sun and were to move on continually with a uniform velocity of thirty miles per hour, it would take three hundred and fifty years to reach its destination. If there was an explosion on the Sun loud enough to be heard by the dwellers upon the earth, and sound should travel at the rate it ordinarily does, the report would not reach the earth till more than *fourteen* years had elapsed. Such is the enormous distance expressed by ninety-two millions of miles! And

yet across this immense chasm the great central body holds the earth in its pathway around him, and influences every movement upon its surface.

Knowing the distance of the Sun, the course to be pursued in gaining a knowledge of his volume and mass is clear. His diameter is about eight hundred and sixty thousand miles, or more than one hundred and eight times that of the earth. If any thing were to pass along this diameter at the rate of twenty miles per hour it would take nearly five years to go from one end to the other. If the earth were placed in the centre of the Sun and the moon at the usual distance from the earth, the moon would still be more than one hundred and ninety thousand miles from the Sun's surface. The diameter, by an easy process, gives the size or volume. It would take one million and a quarter such globes as our own to make a body as large as the Sun, and more than three hundred and twenty thousand to have the same mass. It is apparent from this that the density of the Sun is only about one-fourth that of the earth. The mass being so great, notwithstanding the comparatively small density, the force of gravity on the solar surface would be about twenty-eight times what it is on the earth. A man, if he could be placed there would be crushed by his own weight, for his head alone would weigh nearly three hundred pounds.

#### THE HEAT OF THE SUN.

It is evident to others as well as to scientists, that the heat of the Sun must be intense. Though the *temperature* (as distinct from the *quantity* of heat emitted) may not be accurately measured and stated in just so many degrees, yet it is very certain that it far exceeds anything in intensity that can be produced by artificial means. The following statement, from the lecture of Prof. Charles A. Young, of Dartmouth College, on "The Sun and the Phenomena of its Atmosphere," may help to make the matter clear. He says:

"From very elementary principles of the science of heat it follows, that the temperature of a body placed in the focus of a lens or mirror will not rise above that of the source of heat whose rays are there concentrated, and must generally

fall very far short of it. In fact, the action of the lens is simply to effect a virtual transportation of anything, placed in its focus, towards the source of heat. Now in the focus of a burning lens three feet in diameter, the most refractory solids—platinum, fire clay, the diamond itself—are either instantly melted or dissipated into vapor, and this although (taking into account the imperfections of the lens) the heat is no more intense than if the body were simply placed at a distance from the solar surface considerably greater than the moon's distance from the earth. There can be no doubt, that if the sun should approach as near us as the moon, the earth itself would melt."

Prof. Arthur Searle of the Harvard College Observatory says :

"Some measurements have been made of the light and heat of the photosphere; and the difference between the heat of the iron which it probably contains, and what we call white-hot iron, is no doubt many (some astronomers think many hundred) times greater than the difference between our white-hot iron and cold iron."

Seecchi, Ericsson, Zillner, Pouillet, St. Claire Deville, and others of high scientific authority, whilst they differ in the number of degrees they assign to the temperature of the Sun, yet they all give very high figures, the most reliable being in the tens of thousands.

When we come to consider the *quantity* of heat sent out by this central body, we find determinations of greater agreement. The methods for ascertaining it are more easily applied, and hence considerable accuracy has been attained.

The effort to measure it is made on the very natural assumption that the Sun is subject to natural laws, the same as the fire which warms any room; and that neither can give out heat without some source of supply. The instrument used is the pyrheliometer, invented and first used by the French scientist, M. Pouillet. The principle of it is very simple. The direct rays of the Sun are received on a certain amount of surface; the heat thus obtained is directed for a definite time upon a certain quantity of water, and the consequent elevation of temperature measured by a thermometer; the average inclination of the solar rays is allowed for;

and then is found the ratio existing between the amount of surface employed and the whole surface which receives the Sun's heat at the earth's distance from the Sun. The whole quantity of heat given out in a certain unit of time is thus ascertained. This is the experiment in its plain outline. There are details as to precautions and corrections necessary in the process of making it, which it is not necessary to give.

From an experiment of this kind made by M. Pouillet it is found that, in our measure, nine pounds of water in a vessel one foot square would be raised one degree (Fahrenheit) in one minute. Now it is known how much coal it would be necessary to consume in order to accomplish the same result, and on this basis several interesting calculations have been made as to how much coal would be required to do as much warming as the Sun does over a given area for a given time. Professor S. P. Langley of the Alleghany Observatory, who has been making the solar surface a study for some years, has made the estimate that on as small an area as that occupied by the city of New York, it would take, in the absence of the Sun's heat, twelve million tons of coal per annum to keep the temperature from falling below zero, even if the burning were accomplished in such a way as to make all the heat pass down in the soil and then be radiated from it.

Sir John Herschel, in some experiments made at the Cape of Good Hope in 1838, ascertained that the heat received from the Sun in the zenith would melt on the earth a cake of ice one inch thick in about two hours and twelve minutes. Professor Young, in commenting on this, says:

"Now as there is no reason to suppose that more heat falls upon the earth than upon any other surface of equal size at the same distance, it follows that if the sun were surrounded by a complete shell of ice having the same diameter as the earth's orbit and one inch thick it would all be melted in two hours and twelve minutes. Furthermore, if we suppose this shell to contract, growing thicker of course so as to maintain the quantity of ice unchanged, it would still, since

it intercepts as before all the heat thrown off from the sun, be melted at the same rate—just so many tons of ice per hour: and if we imagine it to shrink clear down upon the surface of the Sun we find that the solar fire would melt its way out at the rate of nearly forty feet per minute. The same result substantially has been arrived at by several other observers.\* To produce this effect by the burning of anthracite coal would require a layer thirteen feet thick all over the Sun to be consumed every hour—two-thirds of a ton per hour to every square foot of surface—such a fire as no earthly furnace can ever parallel. At this rate, if the Sun were made of solid coal, he would burn entirely out in less than six thousand years.”†

How can the Sun constantly send out this marvelous amount of heat? How is this tremendous furnace supplied with fuel? What kind of fire is it that can give out such heat? Is it a fire at all that has burned at this rate for centuries without burning up? Is there any evidence of diminution in the quantity of heat emitted? These are questions that arise in every thoughtful mind and call for an answer. In the present state of science, a full and satisfactory one cannot be given. But some light may be gained from the data we have.

There has been no material change in climates for thousands of years, for the same plants that grew then within certain geographical bounds grow there now. This is an evidence that the amount of heat radiated by the Sun has continued about the same.

\* Sir John Herschel's illustration, so often referred to, may be added: Supposing a cylinder of ice *forty-five miles* in diameter to be continually darted into the Sun *with the velocity of light*, and that the water produced by its fusion were continually carried off, the heat now given off constantly by radiation would then be wholly expended in its liquefaction, on the one hand, so as to leave no radiant surplus; while, on the other, the actual temperature at its surface would undergo no diminution.

† The coal beds of Pennsylvania would probably supply the entire world's consumption for centuries; but I find that if the source of the Sun's heat (whatever it is) were withdrawn, and it were possible to transport these coal beds there and burn them fast enough to keep up the present rate of emission and no more, they would last considerably less than the one-thousandth part of a second.—*Prof. Langley.*

It is stated by one \* whose testimony is regarded of great value, that the heat we receive from the Sun has not diminished by so much as the one-thirty-seventh of a degree since the building of the great Pyramid of Gizeh. So far then as observation goes it cannot be said with any assurance that the Sun is growing either warmer or colder.

Now Pouillet has shown that on the hypothesis of perfect conductibility and the specific heat of water (the highest of all substances), the Sun would have cooled through more than three hundred degrees (Fahrenheit) in one year. In view of this and what has been said of the constancy of the amount of heat for thousands of years, it is an inference fairly drawn, that no fuel we can imagine possibly to exist would enable the Sun, in burning it, to emit so much heat for so long a time. Then again, it is known that oxygen is necessary to support combustion, and therefore the Sun, even if the fuel is there, could not burn in the ordinary sense, because it is in the same condition as a body on the earth when in a vacuum. This then is so much in the way of a negative. It may help to clear the way for what follows.

One theory advanced for keeping up the supply of the Sun's heat is, that large meteoric masses are constantly falling into the Sun, which by their impact generate the necessary amount. Now it is true that heat may be produced in this way as can be shown by striking a piece of cold iron with a cold hammer, thus increasing the temperature of both; or better still by firing a cannon ball against a suitable target, thus heating it to such an extent that it cannot be handled. †

\* Ericsson.

† The amount of heat generated in this way is greater than, at first blush, would be supposed. On the authority of Professor P. G. Tait of the University of Edinburgh, it may be stated that if the earth were allowed to fall into the Sun it would acquire, on reaching the surface, such a velocity that the impact would be equivalent to about ninety-one years of solar heat. The calculations made on the same data for the planet Jupiter give something like thirty-two thousand years. Brilliant exhibitions of this heating effect are frequently seen in the vaporization of meteors as they speed with their marvelous velocities through our atmosphere.

But this theory is untenable, because it would require such a supply to satisfy the demands of solar radiation as would cause greater disturbances of the planet Mercury than any observations justify. It is plain, however, that some small portion of the Sun's heat may be due to this cause, but as a theory for the whole of it it cannot stand.

Another theory\* still less satisfactory, attributes the supply of heat to the friction of the Sun's surface with a supposed atmosphere through which he is passing, just as a globe can be heated by letting it rub against something while it rotates. But this cannot be maintained, for if there really was something to cause so much friction on the solar surface as would be necessary to produce its actual radiation, it is demonstrable that the Sun's rotation upon his axis would be so impeded that it would altogether cease within the period of a few generations.

But it is not necessary, paradoxical as it may seem, that a body losing heat should fall in temperature. The *quantity* may change while the *degree* remains the same. For instance, if a vessel of water whose temperature is forty or fifty degrees be taken into a room where the air is at zero, it will be found, by testing it with a thermometer, that its temperature will sink lower and lower till it reaches thirty-two degrees—the freezing point. There, however, it stops and remains at that till all the water becomes ice. But during all this time the water has been freely parting with heat, and yet the temperature, as revealed by the thermometer, does not indicate it.

Or take the process in the other direction. If a vessel of water be heated instead of cooled and tested as before, the thermometer will show a gradual increase till it indicates two hundred and twelve degrees—the boiling point. There the mercury stops and the water begins to give off steam, but the temperature of the steam is found to be no higher than the water, the additional heat in this case and the loss of heat in the other being used to alter the molecular con-

---

\* Theory of Williams.

dition of the water. The amount gained or lost is proportionately large as is shown by the time required for the freezing and the changing into vapor. Temperature then is no indication of the *quantity* of heat, as a body under certain circumstances may part with or receive much without giving any evidence of it by the indications of the thermometer.

But the steam, rising from the boiling water and indicating the same degree as the water, may have the process of heating continued, and if the process be carried on to a certain high temperature, the steam will be dissociated or resolved into its two component gases, hydrogen and oxygen. These two gases may be made to recombine, and in doing so will set free the heat that was used in separating them. The way is now prepared for stating another theory that has been given to account for the solar supply. It is the theory of *dissociation*. It was "brought forth in Chemistry by M. St. Claire Deville and in Physical Astronomy by M. Faye."\* The reasoning is after this manner: The two gases that are the constituent elements of water, in passing from their dissociated state into combination, disengage heat. Now, the material of the Sun may exist, at comparatively moderate temperatures, in a state of dissociation and on combining give out a great amount of heat; and this being constantly kept up on an enormous scale allows the Sun to carry on his marvelous radiation. This theory is received with much favor.

One more may be given. It is the theory that bases the source of supply on the gradual contraction of the Sun's volume, first presented, it is believed, by Helmholtz. Professor Langley is one of its earnest advocates, and I give the statement of it in his own words:

"We readily see that to lift a great building from its foundation it requires the force of many engines and men. Now, this force is represented by a certain equivalent of heat. Were the Sun composed of hydrogen, the lightest known gas, each cubic mile of it would far outweigh the largest of the Egyptian Pyramids; and when we consider the expenditure

\* Professor Langley.

of force that would be required to lift the structures of Cheops or Gizeh a mile high, we see what force or heat would be given out by each of the six hundred billions of cubic miles next the Sun's surface in falling through that small distance. The hypothesis I refer to then is communicated in the statement that the heat produced by the settling of matter towards the centre, or in other words by the contraction of the Sun's mass as it tends to cool, keeps the temperature nearly constant at the expense of the volume. The truth of this hypothesis, or rather this theory, is shown by its standing the test of external computation."

The Sun, according to this view, is growing smaller, but it has been shown that a "shrinkage of its diameter by the one ten-thousandth part (a quantity imperceptible in our best telescopes) would have supplied all the heat that has been given out since the Christian era."

It is altogether probable that the truth lies in a combination of causes, such as have been given, viz.; the falling of meteoric masses, the combination of gases previously dissociated, and a general contraction of the whole body. No matter, however, what view may be taken, the processes cannot go on indefinitely. Though the Sun is still able at the present rate to warm the earth for millions of years, yet indications point to a failing some time, unless there be the interposition of creative power to renew it. Helmholtz says:

"Though the stove of our planetary system is so immense that it has not been sensibly diminished by the incessant emission which has gone on during the period of man's history, the inexorable laws of mechanics show that this store, which can only suffer loss and not gain, must finally be exhausted."

#### THE SUN'S SURFACE.

Whether the matter composing the central mass of the Sun is in the solid, liquid, or gaseous condition, is a subject on which there is at present no very definite knowledge. This is not at all surprising when it is remembered that so little is known about the interior portion of even our own globe.

However, the belief is entertained by many who have given careful attention to the subject and is gaining a more

and more general acceptance, that the whole mass of the Sun is in a gaseous condition. The interior, according to this belief, is under such an enormous pressure as to make the gas exceedingly dense \* but gas nevertheless, because it has no boiling point and acts like gas in all other respects.

This hypothesis is strengthened by the fact that the Sun's density is very small (being, as before stated, only about one-fourth that of the earth) compared with what it ought to be if the matter composing the Sun, much of which is known, were in a liquid or solid state.

The *surface*, however, is more easily studied and hence its nature is more definitely known. Whatever may be the state of matter in the interior, the exterior portion is certainly gaseous.

Like the earth, the Sun is enveloped by an atmosphere. But the Sun's atmosphere compared with his bulk, vast as it is, is proportionately much deeper than that of the earth. They differ also in the kinds of gases composing them, and in the fact that the Sun's atmosphere is self-luminous. †

Below the atmosphere is a stratum which reveals to us the Sun's surface and marks the well-defined edge of his disk. This is called the *photosphere*, meaning, as the etymology indicates, the sphere that gives the light.

Outside of the photosphere, but close to it, is that part of the atmosphere called the *chromosphere*. It is composed mainly of hydrogen gas, and during the time of a solar eclipse has a vividly red appearance; hence the name in its signification, *color-sphere*. Its edge is usually very rugged, and sometimes there are projections from it of immense height, like jets or streamers or the smoke of a distant locomotive. These are called *prominences* or *protuberances*. Like the atmosphere, they consist mainly of hydrogen and are evidently ejected through orifices in the photosphere. The height to which they rise is, in many cases, forty thousand

---

\* Some think it is so dense as to be in a *viscous* condition.

† It may be added that, notwithstanding this self-luminous character of the solar atmosphere, it intercepts more light than it gives.

miles and occasionally they ascend three or four times that height.\*

The *corona* which encircles the Sun during an eclipse should not be overlooked. It is a "ring of variable extent, and resembles the 'glory' with which painters encircle the heads of saints."† The light generally seems to radiate from the moon's edge extending occasionally six or seven times the Sun's apparent diameter. Its color has been variously described by different observers but all agree in pronouncing it something of exceeding beauty.

The *cause* of the corona is an unsettled question, but it is now generally believed to have its origin in the Sun rather than in the earth's atmosphere or the diffraction of light as it passes the moon's edge.

Leaving the chromosphere, prominences and corona we return to what we *ordinarily* see in observing the Sun.

To the unassisted eye is presented a disk of uniform brightness. But if examined with a telescope of moderate magnifying power, the eye being properly protected the brightness will be found to be not the same in all parts. It is brightest in the centre because the rays from the photosphere come in a more direct course than they do from the edge of the Sun, and hence pass through a much less depth of atmosphere, and consequently suffer less from absorption.

Then again, there will be seen over the whole surface a mixture of bright and dark specks which have been compared to rice grains or when long drawn out, as they often are, to willow leaves. Often some of these near the edge become bright enough to be noticed separately when they receive the name, *faculae* (torches).

But the most marked of all these appearances are the solar spots. They occur principally in two belts each fifteen degrees wide and separated from each other by an equatorial belt

---

\* On September 7th, 1871, Professor Young of Dartmouth College saw a prominence that attained an elevation of *two hundred thousand miles*. This distance is not a mere *guess*, but an accurate estimate based upon reliable data.

† Loomis.

of thirty degrees. The diameter of a spot of ordinary size is ten or twelve thousand miles; of the largest, fifty or sixty thousand miles and sometimes more; and of the smallest, called *pores*, only four or five hundred miles.

They are of a great variety of shapes; occur in large numbers at certain comparatively regular periods; usually consist of a very dark central portion called the *umbra*, and a lighter portion surrounding this called the *penumbra*; and have a supposed connection with certain terrestrial phenomena. The observation of them is surrounded with the deepest interest on account of the help they give in studying the physical constitution of the Sun.

The discussion of their nature along with that of the solar atmosphere etc., and the revelations of the spectroscope as to the chemical constitution of our great luminary will be reserved for a future article.

---

ARTICLE VI.  
CONFESSION.

By FRANCIS SPRINGER, D. D., Hillsboro, Ill.

Confession of Sin has given rise to sharp controversy between Romanists and Protestants.

For convenience of method the subject may be considered under three heads: the Romish, the Protestant, and the Scriptural presentation.

The church of the Pope connects confession of sins with penance and absolution. The priest hears the confession, prescribes the penance, and absolves the sinner. By ordinance of the Council of Trent, Confession is part of the Sacrament of penance. It is deemed essential to salvation, and it is required of the confessing one "to confess all and every mortal sin which, after diligent inquiry, we remember, and every evil thought or desire, and the circumstances that change the nature of the sin." Such comprehensive, searching, and detailed statement of "all and every mortal sin" to

the priest is called Auricular Confession, the plain English of which is the telling of ones sins into the ears of the priest.

According to the Romish theology, the chief utility of Auricular Confession is the facility it affords the priest to ascertain the true disposition and religious temper of the penitent, to the end that the priestly absolution may be adjusted to the exact condition and needs of the penitent: and herein is the tremendous power of the Papacy, which gains all the secrets of its devotees and uses them for purposes of absolute control in affairs secular and religious. The superstitious fears of both the ignorant and the educated of the hierarchy are used for their enslavement under the dominion of ambitious Rome. A distinguishing feature of the Papal Confession is, that it is not optional or occasional, but fixed and compulsory. The obligation to recite one's sins of omission and commission, of outward act and inward thought, imagination and desire, in the ears of the solitary priest shut up in his cage, and to make the recital under the awful inquisition of secrecy,—is universally acknowledged and sacredly heeded by all faithful Romanists the world over.

The Protestant view of the subject either utterly rejects and abhors Auricular Confession, and its attendant priestly absolution, or, placing it among the rubbish of things indifferent, extends to it the indulgence of a permissive institution which, by a remote possibility, might be the means of an occasional benefit.

Chief among the Protestants who give some prominence to this human-devised Sacrament are the Episcopalians and Lutherans. The former have it in their Book of Daily Prayer, and the latter in their Church Creed. In both these denominations the Confession of sin is associated with repentance, and is not fixed, compulsory, and particular in details, but only optional and general. The formulary of the Church of England has these words:

“Almighty God the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who desireth not the death of a sinner, but rather that he may turn from his wickedness and live; and hath given power and com-

mandment to his ministers to declare and pronounce to his people, being penitent, the absolution and remission of their sins: He pardoneth and absolveth all them that truly repent and unfeignedly believe his holy Gospel."

The Lutheran Church Creed makes an awkward presentation of Confession in its Eleventh Article, which seems tremulously hesitant between Rome and Wittenburg. As it stands in "Schott's Augsburg Confession," the Article reads:

"In regard to Confession we teach, that private absolution ought to be retained in the Churches, and should not be rejected entirely; although it is not necessary to enumerate all our sins and transgressions, as this would be impossible, Psalms 19: 12, 'Who can understand his errors?'"

This Article is plainly marked with a wish to get away from popery, but yet to entertain a compromise with some of its adherents. It sets out to speak of confession, and immediately switches off to "private absolution." As confession and absolution go together, the form of language here employed is an obvious device to make private confession at least admissible, by the manner in which the wording associates it with "private absolution." The less offensive is made to hang a little of its own respectability about the shoulders of its more ungainly companion. It is well known that in the time of Luther confession to the priest,—especially private,—was less in favor than was absolution. To the political leaders the confessional was specially distasteful, because valuable secrets of state policy and rival dynasties went into the ears of the hierarchy, and made the Church an over-mastering power in diplomacy and polities. The absolution was less offensive because less capable of intermeddling with affairs of state and the rights of private judgment. In his "Apology" Melanchthon says:

"We also retain Confession, *on account of absolution* which is the Word of God, through which the power of the keys absolves us from our sins."\*

The Lutheran Reformers, no doubt, intended that Confes-

---

\* Book Concord, p. 165.

sion of sins should be practiced, but their writings plainly deny all the features of Confession which are distinctively Romish. For example our Lutheran fathers deny the sacramental character of Confession: they deny also the compulsion by which the Papal Church enforces the observance; and likewise, the requirement which demands an enumeration of all our transgressions.

Pursuing this line of discrimination so clearly brought out by the noble reformers of the sixteenth century, we are led to the less pretentious and far more beneficial presentation which the Holy Bible makes. In this sacred Book the subject is before us in a light wholly unencumbered with human craft and policy, and undarkened by the slightest shade of bigotry or passionate polemics. In 1 John 1:9, we read: "If we confess our sins, he (God) is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." James 5:16, "Confess your faults one to another, and pray for one another, that ye may be healed." Mat. 3:6, "Were baptized of John in Jordan, confessing their sins." Acts 19:18, "Many that believed came and confessed, and showed their deeds."

These passages are fair samples of Gospel words on this important subject. The practice at that day was not stiffened into formulated regularity, but was spontaneous, honest, sincere. No tricks of solemnity for impression's sake, and no pressure of priestly inquisition surrounded the penitent with bewildering awe. The whole process, unperverted by mere human manipulation, was purely an act of the intelligent soul conscious of its guilt, voluntarily and without reserve, pouring out its grief of sin into the ear of God and humbly suing for pardon.

The divine WORD forcibly teaches the duty and the benefits of confessing one's sins, and the implication is everywhere apparent that Confession is due (1) to God, (2) to our fellow beings, and (3) to one's self. Confession is due to God, because all sin is against Him, and He only can pardon and restore the sinner; it is due to our fellow man, because our sin is an injury to him, and he is our brother with whom we should

deal as we would that he should deal with us; and we ought to confess to ourselves, in order that self may be taught not to practice the deception of concealing sin by denying it.

But it is plain that the Bible gives no countenance to the methods of confession enforced by the laws of the Romish Church. The Catechism of the Council of Trent, for example, in speaking of the "power of the keys," avers that "the sacerdotal character is invested with power to retain as well as to remit sins, and that the priest is the judge exercising his discretion in the cases coming before him." (p. 191.) And furthermore, "not only are the faithful to be taught that Confession was instituted by our Lord; but they are also to be reminded that, by authority of the Church, have been added certain rites and solemn ceremonies," (p. 192). The same high authority calls the institution "*the tribunal of penance*," "without recourse to which not even children can hope for salvation." A careful perusal of the explanations and instructions given by the Romanists, in relation to Confession, will convince any unprejudiced mind, that the Papal doctrine of Confession is one of the most dangerous enemies to intellectual, moral, and religious freedom the ingenuity of man or devil has ever conceived. When the Church taught that Confession to a priest was the only means of salvation, the despotism of Rome was complete. The most abject degradation of the body is the enslavement of the soul; and this precisely it was that the Romish Confession did.

Possibly indeed, the Confessional in the hands of Protestantism might be a useful and holy instrument of good without any alloy of evil. Yes, but it is a possibility so remote that no measurement of time practicable on earth can ever reach it. So long as human nature remains imperfect and in the slough of sin, it cannot be entrusted with a power of absolute control over the thoughts and the conscience of society. Pope Leo the Great, in the fifth century, is the first on record who thrust aside the primitive open, social, and public Confession which had been practiced by the earliest Christians and their immediate successors. Leo was a ferocious heresy-hunter and persecutor, and at the same time the lawful

and acknowledged representative and head of the Christian Church. May not the same arrogance and defection from Christ occur again in the very house of his friends? Power in possession is corrupting to the possessor, even though the possessor be a Christian. If the hands of the priest receiving the private confessions of his parishioners, were clean when he first began the dangerous secret service, they would soon become foul by continuance in it. Such is the testimony borne by the history of the Church. As Apostolic Christianity was perverted from its simplicity and heathenized into Romanism, so does Protestantism tend toward bigoted and boastful sectarianism.

A dreamy theology, as logical and consistent in theory as was John Locke's constitution of government for one of the original colonies of America, may be pleasant recreation for the genius of the philosopher or the imagination of the poet, and quite as illusive and impracticable.

Certainly, the most sensible, as well as the most Christian way for us disciples of the Redeemer, is to accept, practice, and cherish the plain teachings of the Gospel on the duty of Confession, and therewith be in thankful and happy content. We must neither add to nor subtract from the things which are written in the divine Book of life. Least of all, is it allowable for the followers of Christ to employ his divine name and Kingdom as the covering of a system of tyranny over the brotherhood: and can any one deny that Auricular Confession, stated, necessary and obligatory, to an official person who is authorized by human law to receive such Confession, and grant or withhold forgiveness of sin as he may think fit,—is an instrument of tyranny most debasing and infamous? Nor is there the least foundation for this rite in the New Testament: and whilst the lack of Scriptural authority is no serious hindrance to the Romanist, who claims that "the creed or religious belief of Catholics is not confined to the Scriptures,"—it certainly must be so regarded by the Protestant.

In few words, well considered and tightly knit into syllo-

gism, this doctrine of Auricular Confession is thus argued by a learned and eminent bishop of the Papal Church :

"The power of the keys, or the right of absolution and retention, has been given by Christ to his apostles and to their lawfully consecrated successors. But this power cannot be effectively exercised without auricular confession. Therefore, by a necessary consequence from Holy Scripture, the religious obligation of auricular confession has been demonstrated."

Can logic be more conclusive than is this? Yet with all its syllogistic conclusiveness, nothing is proved or rendered clearer or more certain than it was before. "The power of the keys, or the right of absolution and retention has been given by Christ to his apostles and to their lawfully consecrated successors." What an immensity of unproved assumption is here accepted for indisputable and unchallenged truth! And then, the conclusion is, "necessary consequence from Holy Scripture." It is just by such weak tricks of smartness that the Holy Bible is burdened and dishonored with the authorship of many untruths, and our divine Christianity itself is forced into the service of knavery and falsehood. But this reasoning of the distinguished Romish bishop, M. Trevern, is a fair specimen of the best scriptural proof of Auricular Confession to a priest, anywhere met with in writings of Catholics. The main point is, that the Confession is indispensable to the effectiveness of the keys; that is, unless we can have the Confession, we must be without the keys. But is this the kind of Confession which the Gospel teaches? Surely not, else would we find in the Gospel the Romish definition, or something to warrant it, namely, "By Confession is understood the declaration which the penitent sinner makes of his sins to a priest."\*

And what else is this deference to the priest, when we are pressed with the burden of our sin, but the substitution of a mere man for the divine Mediator? The lesson of the Sacred Book on this point is (1 Tim. 2:5,) "There is one God and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ

\* See "Faith of Catholics," p. 283.

Jesus." And this is enough, because God himself has so decided. Then, to God and our Saviour, "the Christ of God," and not to sacerdotal assumption, must be our penitent confession; and, as is also divinely commanded, to our fellow man whom our iniquity has injured, must be made honest and hearty confession and suitable restitution.

"Whate'er  
I may have been, or am, doth rest between  
Heaven and myself—I shall not choose a mortal  
To be my Mediator "

As an instrument for the maintenance of an external and visible unity of all Christians, private confession to an ecclesiastical official is undoubtedly a most potent device; and the same may be said of all the seven sacraments of the Romish hierarchy. The external unity of all Christians is the theoretical center of the Roman Catholic Church. Hence comes the never-ceasing averment of her priests and populace, that there is no salvation outside the pale of Catholicism, which, in this connection, means Romanism. When Protestants yield to the luring bait of Romish rites, and the Romish scheme of Christian unity, they are like the demoralized Israelites whom Moses is trying to rescue from Egyptian bondage;—they long for the flesh-pots of their masters, and are weak enough to stoop to a yoke which the Divine Master does not impose. Oneness in Christ is spirit-likeness to Him, not the uniform of unvarying dogmas, ceremonies, and external drill.

To us Lutherans the careful and dispassionate consideration of this subject is a duty of supreme importance, because the doctrinal declaration of Lutheran faith contains an article which seems to enjoin secret confession and conference with an "ecclesiastical searcher of conscience." As a rule, the teachings set forth in the several Articles of the Augsburg Confession, are amply illustrated and proved by quotations from the *Sacred Word*; but the Eleventh Article is a remarkable exception to this rule, not only in *Schott's Confession and Symbols*, and Dr. S. S. Schmucker's Theology, but also in the Book of Concord. This omission of Scripture

texts in proof of the Eleventh Article can be accounted for only by the fact, that the Sacred Scriptures contain no such texts. In this view of the case, the Article in question should be allowed to remain a dead letter, or be expunged from the creed of Lutherans.

Possibly so to speak as above, in the opinion of some, may be characterized as rash; but to the writer there will always be the consolation that while his temerity may be that of weakness or ignorance, the temerity of those who would take from or add to the plain teachings of the Bible is downright wickedness.

Any movement among Protestants of the present day, toward the re-establishment of private confession and absolution, as was generally in practice about the period of the Reformation by Martin Luther, will be regarded by large numbers of the most devout, intelligent, and active Christian workers, both lay and clerical, as a re-enactment of the heathenizing processes of the earlier centuries, when Romish errors first began.

The time is probably not distant when the question, "who is a Lutheran?" must be settled. In that settlement, the Eleventh Article and those who have faith in it, and those who do not have faith in it, will be summoned to a trial of skill in the work of reconciliation. May we not hope that such a measure and fullness of the genuine Christian spirit may yet come to all who bear the Lutheran name, as will enable them to bear patiently one another's differences, and to live and work together in the service of our divine Lord and Saviour?

## ARTICLE VII.

## THE ORIGIN OF LIFE, OR THE GERM THEORY.

By E. S. BREIDENBAUGH, A. M., Conrad Professor of Chemistry and Mineralogy in Pennsylvania College.

- I. *Evolution and the Origin of Life.* By H. CHARLTON BASTIAN, M. A., M. D., F. R. S.—Professor of Pathological Anatomy in University College, London. London and New York, Macmillan & Co. 1874. 12mo. pp. 186.
- II. *On Fermentation.* By R. SCHUTZENBERGER, Director of the Chemical Laboratory at the Sorbonne. No. XX. of the International Scientific Series. New York, D. Appleton & Co. 1876. 12mo. pp. 331.
- III. *On the Optical Department of the Atmosphere in reference to the Phenomena of Putrefaction and Infection.* Abstract of a paper read before the Royal Society, Jan. 13, 1876, by Prof. TYNDALL, F. R. S. Communicated by the author to Nature, Jan. 27th, and Feb. 3d, 1876.
- IV. *The Spontaneous Generation Controversy.* By Rev. W. H. DALLINGER, V. P. R. M. S.—From Popular Science Review—Popular Science Monthly, Aug. 1876.
- V. *Pasteur on Fermentation,* Translated by L. A. STIMSON, M. D., from Bulletin de l'Académie de Medicine. Popular Science Monthly, Oct. 1875.

This subject is one that has for some time been occupying the attention of the advanced thinkers of the medical profession, and has excited much interest among Biologists. The investigation requires the most careful scientific accuracy, and being strictly a question of experiment, affords the non-scientific world an opportunity of observing how specialists pursue their inquiries. This article gives a brief resumé of the discussion, with the results obtained by the most recent investigations, as given in the above mentioned works and papers that have recently appeared on this subject.

Dr. Bastian has been the most industrious and most original modern champion of the idea of Spontaneous Generation. In this work he presents a summary of the experi-

ments and conclusions detailed in his larger work, "The Beginnings of Life (1872)," supplemented by such results obtained in the interval as, in his opinion, strengthen his position.

While Dr. Bastian presents, in the strongest possible manner, most carefully and clearly the arguments upon which the idea of Spontaneous Generation now rests, he labors under the disadvantage of too evidently making a special plea for a hypothesis, which he very emphatically and constantly asserts is already proven correct, and scouting at even the plausibility of any contra argument, is impatient of any doubt on the part of his cotemporaries.

In this respect Schützenberger, in his Monograph on Fermentation, offers a striking contrast; while distinctly adopting one view of the subject, he states very frankly the position held by other investigators. Himself a student of the phenomena he describes and explains, he is avowedly a follower of M. Pasteur, the most successful investigator of the phenomena of fermentation, yet at times he very decidedly dissents from, or modifies his approval of, conclusions, or of the value pertaining to certain experiments or observations made by M. Pasteur. This work gives, in comparatively small compass, the most trust-worthy conclusions of the day in regard to Fermentation, with abstracts of the observations originating, sustaining and proving the views now held.

The authors of the papers referred to are men of acknowledged prominence in their special departments—and hardly merit the insinuations of Dr. Bastian that they are prejudiced *a priori* against the idea of the origination *de novo* of the lower organisms. The opinions of M. Pasteur are specially valuable, because he has spent many years, fruitful in results in studies of this character—first in ascertaining the nature and checking the vegetative parasitic disease that threatened the entire destruction of the silk worms of France, afterward in examining and curing the diseases of wines, and finally in the analysis of the nature of Fermentation. In each investigation he displayed the most consummate skill, and attained such results as restored prosperity to certain

industries, whose impending destruction seemed to bring a blight upon all France.

The books and papers treat of the life of the lowest organisms of which we are cognizant, and more particularly with respect to secondary causes through which they may have come into existence.

The study of Fermentation affords a most satisfactory introduction to the peculiarities of these lower orders of life. Early observers noticing the effervescence that occurs on adding the yeast to wort, and also many similar phenomena in the change undergone by saccharine solutions—or in bread making, confounded the action with that which takes place on adding Muriatic Acid to a solution of Bicarbonate of Soda, and designated the several phenomena by the term Fermentation (*Ferrere*), because of the boiling action. Afterwards the products of the several results were found to differ—alcohol and carbonic acid gas being found in saccharine solutions, sugar in place of starch in the bread, and the results in the soda solution to be purely inorganic.

Later observers noticed that a pellicle appearing in the saccharine solution grew as the fermentation continued—it being ascertained that this pellicle was a vegetate growth, an animated discussion arose as to the relation between the two facts. For instance, Liebig contended, that the plant in the act of growing communicated motion to the particles in solution, thus mechanically breaking up the molecules of sugar, into molecules of alcohol and carbonic acid gas. The relation as understood by the vitalists has been thus formulated by Turpin: "Fermentation as effect and vegetation as cause, are two things inseparable in the decomposition of sugar."\*

These phenomena are best described in alcoholic fermentation. The juice of the grape contains a certain quantity of sugar, after standing for some time the sugar is observed to be gradually disappearing, carbonic acid gas is passing into the atmosphere, and alcohol, with very small quantities of glyc-

---

\* Schützenberger, p. 43.

erine and succinic acid,\* is found in the solution. The weights of these products nearly aggregate that of the altered sugar, a certain comparatively small amount of oxygen was unaccounted for till careful examination showed that it was consumed in the growing of the yeast plant.

The ferment in general, of which yeast is one variety, is a minute living organism of one cell, round or oval, (*Saccharomyces Cerevisiae* measure in their greatest diameter .00031 — .00035 in.) In the fermentable liquid it reproduces by the method of budding (one cell giving rise to several small vesicular prominences which increase in size and gradually by a stricture at the point of union are separated from the mother cell at whose expense they have grown. If the ferment is not in a fermentable liquid but exposed to the air, after some hours within the protoplasm of the cell, the small granulations slowly aggregate into two to four "islets," and becoming connected gradually mature, when the wall of the mother cell is ruptured and the *spores* are ejected and separated. (Spores of the *Saccharomyces Cerevisiae* measure .00015 — .00019 in. in diameter.) These spores having the same function as the seeds of flowering plants, produce plants like those from which they have originated. The growth by budding is so rapid, that M. Engel has estimated that one cell of *Mycoderma vini* produces in 48 hours about 35,978 cells.

Only a small amount of ferment is necessary to cause the alteration of a comparatively large amount of sugar. While the ferment removes a small quantity of oxygen from the sugar—the remainder of the oxygen carbon and hydrogen of the sugar is converted almost entirely into alcohol and carbonic acid gas. The ferment itself ceases to manifest vital functions at a temperature above 149° F. (generally at 140°), whilst spores, as will be shown below, will germinate after being submitted to a much higher temperature.

M. Pasteur† thus expresses his view of the general and widely extended action of ferments: "Every being, every

\* Still smaller quantities of other substances have at times been observed.

† Popular Science Monthly, Oct. 1875, p. 713.

organ, every cell which has the faculty of accomplishing chemical processes without using free oxygen, produces at once phenomena of fermentation." In speaking of this subject, the same author describes the successive action of different, ferments in the same liquid. After the sugar is entirely converted into alcohol, a class of ferments, (vinegar yeast) begins to grow and absorbing oxygen from the air, burns the alcohol into acetic acid, which by a different action is burned into water and carbonic acid gas, as is seen in spontaneously weakened vinegar. Bacteria, and afterwards moulds, take possession of the solution, and continue to live as long as they find any food—leaving finally only water, ashes, and the germs of the various life, ready to be scattered by the wind.

Such facts could not be observed without suggesting the inquiry, What is the source of the first germs of each kind of life that appears in the solutions?

Two explanations have been made, one that if a solution contains the materials of which the protoplasm of the cells is composed, these materials can by a re-arrangement of their particles, through an inherent power, produce the living organism. This is termed Archebiosis, (Huxley's—Abiogenesis.\*). On the other hand it is maintained, that germs are introduced through the air or other extraneous source and finding suitable nourishment, grow, reproduce, and in general perform the functions of life. This is termed Panspermism, (Huxley's—Biogenesis. <sup>†</sup>).

Bastian <sup>‡</sup> thus states the two views:

"(1) The hypothesis of *Archebiosis* (carrying *Heterogenesis*<sup>‡</sup> with it as a necessary consequence), which supposes that these minutest living things have come into being and into the region of the visible, by a process of chemical com-

\* Lay Sermons, Addresses, &c. p. 350.

† Evolution and the origin of life, p. 51.

‡ The term Heterogenesis may be used to denote alternate generation, or a kind of evolution, termed by Huxley *Xenogenesis*, "which means the generation of something foreign." (Lay Sermons, &c., p. 352.) This point does not enter into our present discussion.

bination and growth, similar in kind to that by which crystalline germs originate in other fluids."

"(2) The theory of *Panspermism* (discrediting both Archebiosis and Heterogenesis), which supposes that the minutest living things above referred to, have merely developed in the fluids, owing to the accidental presence therein of invisible 'germs' thrown off from pre-existing living organisms."

That the alcoholic ferment comes from the must found on the shell of the grape, is evident from the fact, that the juice transferred from the grape to a suitable vessel without coming in contact with the outside of the shell or of the air will not evince alcoholic fermentation, but the addition of a few drops of water that has been used to wash a single grape will originate the alcoholic fermentation.

How these germs come to appear on the must will be gathered from the following discussion.

The phenomena connected with the life of these lower organisms, is best studied in solutions in which they thrive most vigorously. Among such preparations are infusions of Hay, Turnip, Meats, etc., which being first made are quite clear, but after a few hours a small pellicle appears and gradually the solution becomes cloudy, turbid, and after a while dense with a growth of Bacteria, Monads, Vibrios, Torula and other microscopic vegetative organisms—round or cylindrical—reproducing by buds or spores.

In deciding this question, *a priori* reasoning has very little weight. Still this method has been employed, Dr. Bastian arguing from the nebular hypothesis and certain conceptions of evolution, thinks that the general uniformity of nature requires a belief in Spontaneous Generation. The most ardent and able Evolutionists, such as Huxley and Spencer, see no necessary connection between this origination of and evolution in life—the theories of evolution all start with existing life; although certain evolutionists have ventured conceptions of the possible secondary causes involved in the beginning of life.

Our devout trust in God as the Creator need not be shaken by any decision resulting from the investigation of this ques-

tion, for God may have introduced the first life through some secondary cause, which may seem to us at present very doubtful. However nothing has yet appeared that calls for any alteration in our present conception of the origin of life.

This question is not a recent one, but as means of investigation have been enlarged and methods of work have become more accurate, the hope of more positive information has reopened the question, while the advance of microscopic science has driven the question farther and farther back among the minutest organisms. This fact creates a predisposition in favor of Panspermism, but it is what investigators would naturally expect.

The question is not however one of mere argument, but of rigid experiment, whose conditions are well stated by the late Prof. Jeffries Wyman:\*

“There can therefore be no certainty of the existence of spontaneous generation in a given solution, until it can be shown that this has been freed of all living organisms which it contained at the beginning of the experiment and kept free of all such from without during the progress of it.”

Their appearance even then he terms only “probable” evidence as “the absolute proof of spontaneous generation is from the formation of living organisms out of inorganic matter.

Such considerations have led Schützenberger † to say :

“A single experiment which proves by a negative result, that organic infusions, protected from germs from without, do not give birth to infusoria, is worth more, scientifically speaking, than ten experiments tending to establish the contrary opinion.”

The first condition as laid down above is attained in one of two ways.

1. As these organisms are destroyed at  $140^{\circ}$ — $149^{\circ}$  F., by boiling an infusion all life is destroyed and the solution will remain clear; if life appears, we conclude, either that spores

\* American Journal of Science and Art, Sept., 1867.

† On Fermentation, p. 310.

(or germs) have been introduced, or that Archebiosis has taken place.

2. If there be contained in a solution certain proportions of substances containing Carbon, Oxygen, Hydrogen and Nitrogen, with the earthy or ash constituents of plants,\* and a drop of an infusion containing living organisms be introduced, it is found that these organisms will thrive as well as in the infusions. After life has been manifested, if the solution is boiled and germs excluded, it will remain clear unless Archebiosis be true.

The second condition is attained in various ways:

1. The air is carefully calcined before coming in contact with boiled infusions.

2. The air is filtered through cotton † which mechanically removes the germs.

3. The glass vessel containing the solution is carefully sealed by fusing the drawn out neck, while the infusion is boiling.

The general result of the experiments detailed by the authors already cited, is that the appearance of life in solutions thus treated is exceptional—even in the work of Dr. Bastian. Yet he and certain followers so far forget the nature of scientific proof that they argue from exceptional cases.

E. Ray Lankester protests ‡ “against Dr. Bastian’s proceedings, in citing a number of observers *in support* of his views (*NATURE*, Feb. 10, 1876,) whose researches taken in each case—as a whole—furnish conclusive arguments *against* his views.”

In three of the one hundred and ninety-three, otherwise negative experiments made by Prof. Tyndall, life appeared—each case being traced by that cautious observer to germs, he says, if the germs had not been discovered, “we should have

\* Such as Iron, Potash, Soda, Phosphorus, Sulphur, etc.

† Cotton, unless carefully prepared, may itself introduce germs; fibrous asbestos previously heated is sometimes employed.

‡ *Nature*, Feb. 24, 1876.

had three cases of Spontaneous Generation far more striking than many that have been adduced."

The futility of Dr. Bastian's reasoning is sharply exposed by Rev. Mr. Dallinger. Dr. Bastian details\* two typical experiments, one of which very briefly described consisted in placing an infusion of common cress and a few leaves in a flask which was sealed while boiling, and then heated in a digester to 270—275° F. for twenty minutes, and to 230° F. for an hour, on opening the flask after the expiration of nine weeks "*there appeared more than a dozen very active monads.*" Dr. Bastian describes these monads very fully,—Rev. Mr. Dallinger and Dr. Drysdale, both accomplished microscopists, in studying various minute organisms, examined in careful detail the life phenomena of this very monad, which they, as also Dr. Bastian, found perished at 140° F., but in addition they found that its spores survived after exposure to a temperature of 300° F. Dr. Bastian employed a temperature 25° less.

It has been objected that in the above mentioned methods the power of the air to sustain and much more to permit generation of life, is destroyed by calcining, filtering or the action in sealed flasks.

At this juncture, Prof. Tyndall after most painstaking and skilfull researches gives his testimony. After carefull examination† of the subject he came to the conclusion, ‡ "that the power of developing life by the air, and its power of scattering light, would be found to go hand in hand." That is, if a beam of light be set through air in which the organic matter is destroyed (burnt), its path will not be visible as in ordinary uncalcined air.

Boxes were prepared with glass fronts, hinged backs, and panes of glass set in the sides, the bottoms were perforated to hold test tubes (glass tubes sealed at one end), in the tops pipettes were fixed in such a manner as to admit of both lat-

\* Evolution, etc., pp. 175—180.

† As detailed in *Fragments of Science*, in the article on Dust and Disease.

‡ *Nature*, Jan. 27, 1876.

eral and vertical movement, without admitting air, also to preserve the equilibrium of the air, in the tops were inserted two bent tubes stoppered with cotton to prevent germs being carried in by the feeble currents of air. A beam of electric light being sent through the box its track was plainly visible. After three days the dust had settled, and was held by the glycerine with which the inside was varnished—a beam of electric light on now being passed was visible without the box while within was darkness. If the door was opened for an instant then the beam of light was scattered. Here we have a discerning power beyond that of the finest microscopes. Infusions of hay, turnips, liver etc., were now introduced into the test tubes through the pipette—and then boiled—out of one hundred and thirty-nine tubes life appeared only in the three already referred to, although the tubes were exposed for several months. Six hundred tubes with similar contents exposed to the air at various places, in a very short time became turbid with vegetative growth.

In these experiments the air was entirely unaltered, only in the quiet of the closed box the germs had settled from the enclosed air. The door of the box being opened for an instant, the solutions that had remained clear for months became after two days turbid with Bacteria.—Well may M. Pasteur say, "In the actual state of the science, the hypothesis of spontaneous generation is a chimera." \*

The phenomena of the growth of vegetative organisms in milk, and other albuminous or alkaline matters has not been so clearly determined, as the point at which this life is destroyed seems to be above  $212^{\circ}$  F. The further examination of the subject is looked for with interest.

From the conclusions now obtained we can form a very clear idea of the final issue. Although interesting in itself a greater interest pertains to the subject because of its practical application. These investigations point very decidedly to the theory that epidemics are promoted, contagion is effected, gangrene in wounds is originated, by the germs suspended

\* In a letter to Prof. Tyndall communicated to *Nature*, Feb. 17, 1876.

in the air. The facts observed even afford very plausible explanations of the exceptional cases—e. g. germs not being equally distributed in place or time, nor in respect to quantity or quality, may explain why certain apparently exposed localities may escape an epidemic that prevails in immediate neighborhoods. The vitality of the germs also differs greatly, as in activity of fresh and old yeast—some constitutions may be able to resist the influence of introduced germs that have lessened vitality.

Prof. Tyndall, in summing up his inquiry, remarks, \*

“That he will hardly be charged with any desire to limit the power and potency of matter. But holding the notion he does on this point, it is all the more incumbent on him to affirm that as far as inquiry has hitherto penetrated, life has never been proved to appear independently of antecedent life.”

---

## ARTICLE VIII.

### THE MISSION OF THE CHURCH.

By P. FELTS, D. D., Johnstown, N. Y.

“Charity begins at home” is an old and oft-repeated adage, which, containing a grain of truth, is not unfrequently so interpreted as to make it teach a pound of error. Extremely selfish and parsimonious people have found in it an excuse for their culpable neglect of the destitute, for their meagre contributions to the benevolent operations of the church, for their utter disregard of the Macedonian cry, constantly arising from the wilds of Africa, the jungles of Hindoostan, the plains of China, and the isles of the sea, “*Come over, and help us.*”

The Church of Christ is emphatically a missionary Church. It originated in mission work, and has been perpetuated by like means. Christ Himself, its divine founder and head, who bought it with His blood, and has preserved it by His

---

\* *Nature*, Feb. 3, 1876.

power, was its first missionary, whom, we may regard, when looking upon the human side of His life, a Home, but on the divine side, a Foreign Missionary. By birth a Jew, His labors were principally confined to those of His own nation. He began His work at home. Dwelling in the bosom of the Father, by Him was He sent into the world "to seek and to save that which was lost."

After Christ, came the apostles—twelve missionaries—chosen and qualified by Him for mission work. Connected with their commission to preach the gospel were the instructions, "Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not: but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, Mat. 10: 5, 6. According to the Master's express command, the apostles were, therefore, to follow in His footsteps, in this as in many other respects, by beginning to work for the world's regeneration at home.

Nature dictates that those allied to us by consanguinity or nationality should be the first objects of our solicitude, and the first subjects of our benevolence. Tacitus, a heathen writer, says, "Liberos cuique ac propinquos natura charissimos esse voluit." But what other is the voice of nature than the voice of God? The Almighty Father speaks just as definitely to us through our mental and moral endowments as through His written Word. If love of kindred be an original principle of our natures, which I believe it to be, then, God commands us through it, to devote ourselves to their well-being before looking after others.

Now, with this principle implanted in the human heart by its beneficent Creator, the gospel must harmonize, as both have a like origin. Nature and Revelation cannot conflict. God never teaches one thing by His works, and the opposite by His word. "He cannot deny Himself." While therefore we find the sentiment written with the finger of the Almighty, within the red-leaved volume of the human heart "Charity begins at home," we also find accordant truths written by the same finger upon the sacred page.

Charity, however, never ceases its work at the place of beginning. It is progressive in its operations. St. Paul not

only asserts that "if any man provide not for his own, especially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel," 1 Tim. 5:8; but likewise commands, "As we have opportunity, let us do good unto all men," Gal. 6:10. Benevolence, like the light of the sun, is diffusive. There is not a possibility of confining it within the narrow limits of a family, or the boundaries of a nation. The wants, the sufferings and the sorrows of those who were "aliens to the commonwealth of Israel" touched the benevolent heart of Jesus, no less than the wants, sufferings and sorrows of the sons and daughters of Jacob. Were not the Roman father, the Syrophenician mother, the Samaritan woman made sensible of the fact, by acts of kindness, that His heart throbbed in love for those unable to pronounce the Shibboleth of the Jew? And in Him we have our model. He has not merely in His word given us the details how to build, but likewise in His life the model after which to build. From His example we learn that not simply those of a particular household, community or nation, should awaken our sympathies, but every form of wretchedness, wherever it may exist, every tear of sorrow, wherever it may fall, should thrill our hearts with pitying love. Hence, we say, although home is the place to begin the sublime work of saving men, yet he who limits himself to so narrow a sphere must either be ignorant of the requirements of the gospel, or guilty of dereliction of duty. Gospel precepts forbid our stopping with a single family, congregation, community, or nation, but urge us on beyond the seas, over mountain barriers, through frost and fire, through tropical green and artic snow, until from the earth's girdle to its poles, all nations, tribes, and peoples "shall know the joyful sound." Christ not only says to every converted soul, "Go home to thy friends and tell them how great things the Lord hath done for thee," Mark 5:19, but in addition to this, commands, Go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature, Mark 16:15. Hence all believers should, in every Christian way possible, seek the advancement of Christ's kingdom, both at home and abroad. Missionary operations,

whether directed towards such as may be famishing for the bread of life at our very doors, or perishing with spiritual hunger in the uttermost parts of the earth, are identically the same work. Consequently the issue sometimes raised between Home and Foreign Missions, with regard to their relative importance, is unwarranted by the gospel. There cannot possibly be any antagonism between them. Both are equally important. Both are aiming to accomplish the same purpose. Therefore he who would give his entire support to the home work, and utterly refuse aid to the foreign field, or *vice versa*, is as injudicious as a coachman, who while wishing his carriage to run easy and noiseless, would oil only one arm of the axle, and leave the other perfectly dry, wearing and grinding and creaking with every revolution of the wheel. The Christian Church has but one mission, and that this may be fulfilled it should be liberally sustained in all of its departments of labor.

In the organization of the Church we have most manifestly evidence of design. God never does any thing without a purpose, neither does He employ a particular instrumentality for the attainment of a specific end, when another would be more available. Infinite wisdom never experiments, is never at a loss for the proper means to effect contemplated results.

The Church is an instrumentality, in God's hands, for the accomplishment of His gracious purposes towards our world lying in wickedness. Its mission, therefore, is to carry forward, to a glorious consummation, the work began by its Divine Founder. As to the nature of this work, Christ Himself gives all needful information, where He says "God sent not His Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through Him might be saved," John 3 : 17.

Christ's mission contemplated nothing less than the regeneration and salvation of our sinful race. When,

"Down from the shining seats above  
With joyful haste He fled,"

it was to do His Father's will, "who," St. Paul says, "will

have all to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth," 1 Tim. 2 : 4.

The relation sustained by God to "all men" confirms our faith in His willingness to save all. "Have not all one Father?" asks the prophet: "Hath not one God created us?" Moses in his cosmology answers these questions affirmatively: "God created man in His own image, in the image of God created He him; male and female created He them. And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth," Gen. 1 : 27, 28. So likewise the apostle Paul, in his great sermon on Mars' Hill, where he declared to the Athenians, who boastfully assumed for themselves a different and nobler origin than that of the barbarians, that God "hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth," Acts 17 : 26. Mankind have a common origin—one Father, who loves all, and therefore desires the salvation of all. Esquimaux, Hotentot, Ethiopian, can as truly and confidently look to the Eternal Throne, and repeat their "Pater noster," as Teuton, Celt, or Briton.

God's character and moral attributes evince a willingness on His part to save "all men." Impartiality, goodness, benevolence, patience, love and mercy are constantly displayed in His gracious and providential dealings towards the children of men. "Of a truth I perceive," said Peter, the Jew, in the house of Cornelius, the Gentile, "God is no respecter of persons," Acts 10 : 34. Every man looking beneath the surface of things will be compelled to make a like acknowledgment. God's gifts in nature, through which our temporal comforts are promoted, are unlimited in their applicability to any particular class of individuals. The same sun sheds his rays on all, the same starry heavens alike canopy all with grandeur; the air we breathe has an original adaptation to all who inhale it; the flowers bloom to please, and the birds sing to cheer one as much as another. Earth has been made a wide garden of pleasant fruits and summer blooms, but little inferior, perhaps, to the straitened paradise

that was lost, that all of God's children might share in His rich bounty.

And yet, we have to admit, that in the inequalities in the condition of men, there is an apparent partiality manifested in God's providences. To one man is given an iron constitution, he passes his days and nights undisturbed by ache or pain; another, from his very birth, is the victim of disease, scarcely knowing the enjoyment there is in a moment's freedom from physical suffering. One is possessed of the highest intellectual endowments, his mind grasps the most intricate subjects it would seem almost intuitively; another has not intellect sufficient to learn the alphabet, or to count his fingers. The birth place of one is in a Christian land, where he possesses all the accessories necessary to help him on his way to glory and to God; another has his lot cast in some benighted corner of the earth, where every surrounding tends to carry him onward to the vortex of irretrievable ruin and eternal death. Here are irregularities that, to those taking merely a superficial view of things, may seem to reflect upon the goodness and impartiality of God. But when we take into consideration, the grand principle of compensation, which is manifestly characteristic of the Divine Government, what appeared to be a substance, is ascertained to be a delusion. Every loss has a corresponding gain. What the sick and infirm may lose in physical enjoyment may be more than made up to them in spiritual. Blindness to those possessing perfect vision seems a great affliction, and yet the blind are usually the most cheerful of men. Many a man who has lost his sight in mature life, has pronounced his last years the best. The interior vision has become clearer and more profound. The sense of hearing has become more acute, as well as that of feeling more delicate, and thus the loss of the one sense is compensated by gain in the others. Kitto thanked God that total deafness revealed to him music that he never imagined before. Hence, whatever man's condition, however great his physical infirmities, and even sufferings, God's goodness and love appear amid them all, in compensa-

ting for every loss, by the bestowment of equal or even greater blessings. But let it not be forgotten, that everything seemingly, incompatible with rectitude in God as a Sovereign, will be made plain when He sits upon His throne as Judge of angels and of men. Deficiencies will then be fully supplied. At that day it will be more tolerable for the heathen, than for those who have lived in Christian lands without improving their exalted privileges. "That servant, which knew his Lord's will, and prepared not himself, neither did according to his will, shall be beaten with many stripes. But he that knew not, and did commit things worthy of stripes, shall be beaten with few stripes. For unto whomsoever much is given, of him shall be much required," Luke 12: 47, 48. Hence, we say, every one looking beneath the surface of things, studying God's providences in the light of His Word, must be constrained to say with the psalmist, "The Lord is good to all," Ps. 145: 9. "The earth is full of His riches," Ps. 104: 24. We live, and move, and have our being in a world swimming in God's rich bounty. Streams of benevolence are continually flowing from the exhaustless fountain of His love, making green and beautiful the abodes of men, causing the desert-places in human hearts to bud and blossom as the rose.

And then, how patient is God with all. "The Lord is long-suffering to us-ward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance," 2 Peter 3: 9. "Sentence against an evil work is not executed speedily," Ec. 8: 11. The thunder-bolts of wrath, which justice demands, "Hurl without delay," are long held trembling in His hand, while warning after warning is given, before they come crashing down upon the guilty head of the persistent offender.

And then, how great is His mercy—mercy His "darling attribute"—for even the vilest of the vile. "He retaineth not His anger forever, because He delighteth in mercy," Micah 7: 18. "He delighteth in mercy" is the language of the flowers of Gethsemane, dyed in the blood of His own dear Son. "He delighteth in mercy," rings out from the Cross upon which this Son hangs dying, even while from His pale

lips the heart-rending cry is heard, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" Is there a sinner this side the gates of death, but what such mercy can reach? Offered as it was to "Jerusalem sinners," who in the language of the immortal Dreamer in Bedford jail, "had their hands up to the elbows in the heart's blood of Jesus," can we form any other conclusion than that He is willing to show mercy to all?

In the adaptation of the gospel to the spiritual wants of all men, we are more fully confirmed in our faith that God is willing to save all. Mankind have common spiritual wants no less than physical. The soul has need of food and clothing, and medicine, as well as the body, and it must have them, or famish, and stand exposed in its nakedness, and die of its infirmities. The body is dust, and from the dust it gets its supplies. Bread and beefsteak will satisfy its hunger, water its thirst, cotton, and wool, and silk will cover the shame of its nakedness, vegetables and minerals furnish its medicines. But the soul is from above, immaterial, like its great Creator, in whose image it was made. Its wants must be supplied by what is adapted to its nature. It must have spiritual food and drink, spiritual clothing, spiritual medicine. The great God Himself must be its meat and drink, God's righteousness its dress, and God's grace its remedy. What the soul wants then to satisfy its craving desires, to cover its shame, and give it rest, and peace, and joy, is God. Hence the yearnings of the immortal in us can only find satisfaction in God. Job's wail of distress is at some time or other repeated by every soul living without God: "O that I knew where I might find Him." Even in the profoundest depths of Pagan prejudice, error and disbelief, the soul cries aloud for the real Author of its own mysterious creaturehood. No wonder that our Lord exclaimed, "Thou fool!" as He heard the soliloquy of the rich man in the gospel; "Soul, thou hast much goods laid up for many years, take thine ease, eat, drink, and be merry," Luke 12: 19, for as well might we attempt to feed the body on wind or light, as the soul on the goods of earth.

Now, to meet these soul-wants, the Gospel is an absolute

necessity. We must know God before we can enjoy Him, and know Him not only as a Sovereign, but also as a Father; not only as a Lord, but likewise as a Redeemer. Philosophy, through ratiocination, may discover to us a God, as Creator and Governor of the universe, Science build a ladder on which we may climb to the throne of His power, but they fail to reveal to us the benevolence of His heart, or to bring us into the bosom of His love. This is accomplished solely by the gospel. For we must be like God, before we can enjoy Him, and, to be like Him, that wonderful change must be wrought in us of which Christ spake to Nicodemus, when He said, "Ye must be born again," John, 3: 7. A renewed soul, or, in other words, a restoration of God's image in the heart, is just as necessary to the enjoyment of communion with God, as sight is to recognize beauty of color, or hearing sweetness of melody. What pleasure would a blind man derive from a walk through the art galleries of Florence, Dresden, or Rome, although surrounded by the finest specimens of art the world has ever produced? What enjoyment would a deaf man receive from the execution, by the best disciplined orchestra, of Mozart or Beethoven's grandest compositions? Might not the former as well be walking on a barren heath, as amid the great masters, and the latter sit amid a chaos of noise, as the rapturous clash of instruments? So the unrenewed sinner may live in a world so full of God, that, in the language of Seneca, "Whithersoever he turns he sees God meeting him," and yet as far as his enjoyment of God is concerned, he might, were it possible, as well live in a world where God was not. He has no divine sight to apprehend Him in the loveliness of His nature; no divine spirit within him to commune with Him either in the privacy of his own chamber, or in the public sanctuary.

Here the gospel comes in with its rich provisions, its abundance of means, its grand doctrines of the incarnation and atonement, through which we behold "God manifest in the flesh," God making "reconciliation for the sins of the people;" giving us the blessed Word to acquaint us with the "good, and acceptable, and perfect will of God;" the sacrament of

baptism—"a merciful water of life, and a laver of regeneration in the Holy Ghost," and the sacrament of the altar—"the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, under the external signs of bread and wine"—"for the remission of sins."

The Christian religion, therefore, meets every want of the soul, accomplishes for man and in man what every other system has failed to do. Is he ignorant? Here is wisdom. Is he in darkness? Here is light. Is he starving? Here is bread. Is he sick? Here is medicine. Is he naked? Here is dress. Is he trembling under a sense of guilt? Here is pardon. Is he struggling to be delivered from the body of this death? Here is liberty. Just what he wants as a poor, condemned sinner, and all he wants to make him free and pure and happy in the life that now is, and that which is to come, the gospel provides.

The gospel, therefore, alone meets man's case. Made as we are, deliverance from the consequences merely of sin, is not enough for us; we must be delivered also from sin itself. It matters not what difference there may be of race, of language, of rank, of culture, of outward morality; it is enough that we all are human. The first Adam is forever repeating himself in his offspring. And the one imperative necessity of every child of Adam is, to be born again, a work wrought in the soul by the Holy Ghost, such a work as pagan philosophies and false religions never dreamed of. When this is accomplished, then will the soul find rest and happiness in God.

Now, the mission of the Church, is to diffuse a knowledge of the truth among all men, in order to their attainment of this blessed experience, and thus bring our world, a revolted province in God's great empire, into submission to its rightful King. Satan's rule must be broken. God has given the whole earth to His Son, and He must have it. Prophecy's golden age, when "the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the seas," when "the kingdoms of this world will become the kingdoms of our Lord, and His Christ," must dawn. All nations will yet join in one mighty chorus, singing, "Te Deum laudamus." As the

Alpine herdsman, at the going down of the sun, it is said, will take his horn, and through it shout, "Praise ye the Lord," and then a brother herdsman, on some distant slope, takes up the echo, "Praise ye the Lord," and then the same notes are caught up by others on more distant heights, till hill shouts to hill, and peak echoes to peak the sublime anthem of praise, while all within the sound of the summons uncover their heads and bow in their evening worship, so, from continent to continent, and from island to island, the world over, will the sound of the gospel's silver trumpet be heard inviting a disenthralled race to praise the Lord, which in obedience to the summons will bow in worship at the feet of Him who is God over all blessed forevermore. "The heathen may rage," and "the kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together against the Lord and against His Anointed," "scoffers walking after their own lusts" may ridicule the thought, infidels raise the puny arm of opposition, yet the glorious work of evangelization will go forward, the enemies of the truth will melt away as snow and ice before the warm breath of spring, the long expected day will appear, when

"The dwellers in the vales, and on the rocks,  
Shout to each other; and the mountain tops  
From distant mountains, catch the flying joy;  
Till, nation after nation taught the strain,  
Earth rolls the rapturous hosanna round."

We are not insensible to the fact that the work necessary to accomplish so desirable a result, is stupendously great, and if it depended solely upon human wisdom and power, the prospect would be extremely discouraging. Even in nominal Christian lands, how great the majority living "without God" in the world. How many who regard the cross as the symbol of their faith, never do warfare under its banner. How many who call themselves by Christ's name are almost as ignorant of Christ as the Hottentot. The Church of Jesus Christ has almost as great a missionary field among some nations called Christian, as among others where gospel light has

never shone. In addition to the multitudes, for whose conversion the Church must labor in Christian countries, many of whom have the form of godliness but deny its power, there are in the world no less than six millions of Jews, one hundred and fifty millions of Mohammedans, and eight hundred millions of Pagans, who through its instrumentality must be made savingly acquainted with Jesus. And millions upon millions of these, like the Australians, and Feejees, and Diaks, are sunken so low that in the scale of being they are scarcely perceptibly above rats and reptiles. And even those who have attained to a certain degree of civilization, who have acquired no little scientific knowledge, and who surpass, as our great Centennial Exhibition shows, enlightened nations in art, are morally no better, possibly not as good, as the brutish Australians, or cannibal New Zealanders, or snake-eating Africans. The followers of Mahomet, the disciples of Confucius, the votaries of Sivah, Brama and Vishnu, although free from the disgusting habits, the brutish modes of life characteristic of the fetish-worshippers of central Africa, are nevertheless spiritually as foul, just as loathsome and disgusting in the sight of an infinitely pure God. "Man looketh on the outward appearance, but the Lord looketh on the heart," 1 Sam. 16:7. Modern missionaries tell us that St. Paul's description of the state of the heathen world, eighteen hundred years ago, is a true picture of its present condition. Not only do the grossest idolatries and the most abominable licentiousness prevail, but they are "filled with all unrighteousness, fornication, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness; full of envy, murder, debate, deceit, malignity; whisperers, backbiters, haters of God, despiteful, proud, boasters, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents, without understanding, covenant-breakers, without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful; who, knowing the judgment of God, that they which commit such things are worthy of death, not only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them," Rom. 1:29—32. How dark a picture! What a sad state to contemplate! And yet all this shame and wickedness has every missionary of the cross to heathen

lands, to behold and battle against. To these ignorant, be-nighted, wandering souls, a lost God has to be discovered, a lost manhood restored, and a lost way to a blissful immortality revealed.

The accomplishment of a work of so great magnitude demands patient, persevering toil. Changing time-honored customs, uprooting old prejudices, persuading men to abandon the religion of their fathers and embrace a new faith, is no easy task. Such a work is slow and difficult. It takes no little time, and causes no little sweat to flow. And yet this is not a discouraging feature in the case. God took time to create a world, and shall He not take time to re-create it? He takes time to build up an oak, and shall He not take time to build up manhood? The progress of the Church has been slow, we admit, but then there has been progress and nothing but progress. Our Leader has never lost a battle, never been compelled to retreat. From the hour He dyed His garments in blood in the fight with the powers of darkness on the cross until the present, He has gone on conquering and to conquer. Every apparent defeat has been turned into a glorious triumph. The little stone in Daniel's vision, cut out of the mountain without hands, has already become a great mountain, and may sooner than the most sanguine expect, fill the whole earth. The signs of the times plainly indicate that

“There's a fount about to stream;  
There's a light about to beam;  
There's a warmth about to glow;  
There's a flower about to blow.”

The world's wide field is “white already to harvest.” All that the Christian reapers have to do, is to thrust in the sickle and golden grain can be garnered almost anywhere. False systems of religion are fast losing hold on the minds of the people. The eyes of nations in heathenish darkness are turning towards Christian Europe and America for light. Mahomedanism, that deadly Upas that has for centuries poisoned the moral atmosphere where Christianity won many of its first triumphs, is dead to its very roots, and its rotten

boughs are falling day by day. God hasten the time when its dead trunk shall lay prone in the dust, and its deluded, heartless, persecuting, blood-thirsty votaries shall bend the knee and worship that same Jesus, whom they now so much delight to persecute in His people! China's great wall of prejudice is fast crumbling, Japan opens her long closed gates to the gospel herald, Ethiopia is stretching out her hands for help, and the isles of the sea are crying, "We perish with hunger." The great questions now pressing upon the heart of the Church is, How shall these multitudes be reached? Where are the self-sacrificing laborers who will go into these fields and gather their harvests? Where are the Christian men and women, who, taking their lives in their hands, will carry the bread of life to these famishing souls? How can the necessary means be secured for the carrying forward of so expensive a work? For it is a work that demands treasure as well as men.

As society is here constituted, and as all men have temporal wants that must be supplied, the Church cannot fulfill its grand mission on the earth without money. The work is expensive as well as great. Christ's ambassadors should never hesitate in urging His people blessed with this world's goods to give, and to give liberally, for the support of His cause. For, as the old lady said to Dr. Adam Clark, who seemed somewhat disconcerted, when a missionary offering was called for immediately after he had preached a sermon on the freedom of salvation, "Dr., the water is free, but then we must have a silver cup to carry it in."

Looking particularly at the foreign missionary work, we find it necessarily expensive, for it means nothing less than Christian civilization, and all know that the bare appliances of Christian civilization are costly. Every Christian convert in heathendom has been said to cost the Church one thousand dollars. And many look upon this as a small return for the amount expended. But is this a larger sum than is necessary to make our children at home educated men and women? Ought we expect to make the heathen Christians with less

money than those of our own firesides? Let it be remembered that the support of a few missionaries is not all the expense involved in Christianizing the heathen. Appliances necessary to make an American a scholar, Christian and gentleman, are required to make a New Zealander or Cafrian the same. They must have churches, and schools, and printing presses, and scientific apparatuses, and libraries, as well as preachers of the gospel. And all these cost money. But, blessed be God, the Church has enough to meet all these demands. Were its membership only awake to their responsibility, did they regard themselves, as they are, stewards of the treasures entrusted to their care, instead of lords of the possessions they control, the Church would no longer be obliged to go begging for money, but it would come pouring into the Lord's treasury in such amounts that those who are now almost continually crying, "*The treasury is depleted, Give, give, or our missionaries will suffer, the work must cease, and the unfinished walls will stand as a monument of our illiberality,*" would be constrained to cry out, as did Moses in the wilderness, when he beheld the heaps of brass and silver, and gold and gems, brought together for the building of the tabernacle, "*Hold, it is enough.*"

Although men, and professed Christian men, are inclined to give sparingly towards the work of evangelizing the heathen, yet, in a worldly point of view, it is a profitable investment. "He that hath pity on the poor lendeth to the Lord; and that which he hath given will He pay him again," Prov. 19:17. Christian nations, in instances not a few, have realized the fulfillment of this promise, in receiving, through commerce, from those nations evangelized, vastly more than their evangelization cost.

The civilization of the heathen always creates new wants, that must be supplied from Christian countries. Every Pagan, civilized and christianized, assists in fostering commerce, and thus indirectly pays back what his civilization and christianization cost. The profits of our commerce with the Sandwich Islands, in a single year, were \$660,964, while the entire cost of bringing them from barbarism to Christianity,

was only \$1,250,000. Therefore, in one year, they paid back fifty-three per cent. of the whole cost of their Christianization. During this same year, New England received in profits from its commerce with the British possessions in Africa, \$400,786, which was nearly one-fourth as much as was expended for Foreign Missions that year, by all denominations in our country. There is no loss in expending money on the poor, benighted heathen, even in a pecuniary point of view, which is the very lowest view that we can take.

There are other returns we receive for mission work among the heathen decidedly superior to those of finance. The American people, in general, are inclined to mammon-worship. We, as a nation, love money, beyond a doubt, inordinately. Will it pay? is the absorbing question of the day. And by the word "pay," is usually meant dollars and cents, as if silver and gold were the only, or the best pay, that any investment could secure. But how meagre in the eyes of some do dollars and cents appear, when compared with knowledge, and in this respect we are largely in debt even to the heathen, among whom our missionaries have labored. They being men of intelligence and culture, have carefully studied the geography, the botany, the mineralogy, the natural history, the language, the literature, the political economy and modes of thought of the natives of those countries in which they have labored, and thus added rare specimens to those cabinets of knowledge to which scholars have access. Hence the theologian, the scientist, the linguist, the statesman, all are more or less benefited by the foreign mission enterprise. Knowledge is increased, and an increase of sanctified knowledge is an increase of power, usefulness and happiness.

How utterly impossible would it be to measure the influence for good, exerted by the missionary labors and explorations of Dr. Livingstone, who threaded his way through the jungles and along the rivers, and up the table-lands, of Africa, until, broken down by labor and exposure, he fell "asleep in Jesus," in that distant land, surrounded by the dark faces of the benighted people he had come to save. Although dead, his works follow him. How greatly is the geographer in-

debted to him for the patient toil and weary journeys required to settle the long vexed problem of the sources of the Nile? How much the ethnologist, for bringing to light many new and manly races inhabiting the lake country, and interior table-lands? How much the philanthropist, for exposing the gigantic slave-trade in children, kidnapped around the head-waters of the Nile, and sold annually to the number of not less than twenty-five thousand in Egypt, Arabia, Turkey, and Persia?

But this great work is remunerative in another and higher sense, for thereby God is glorified, Zion's chords lengthened, and undying souls saved. Of how little worth do gold and silver appear, or even human wisdom, by the side of an immortal soul? To "save a soul from death," to rescue it from infinite depths of shame, and to be instrumental in its attainment of happiness perhaps greater than that which an archangel now enjoys, and glory greater than that with which an archangel now is clothed; is not that a sufficient reward for the greatest, and most self-denying labors; the largest interest that can be received on monetary investments? If Heaven's jasper walls are built by angelic hands, and by them its gates of pearl hung, and golden pavements laid, and princely palaces reared, rather would I be the means of bringing one soul to the enjoyment of that heaven, than to see my name written in burning sapphires as its architect.

In addition to men and money, the fulfillment of the Church's mission demands earnest, believing prayer. "Ask of me," says the Father to His Son, "and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession," Ps. 2:8. The Father had the disposition to give, but the Son must make the request. His prayers were to prevail. The same assurance given to the God-man with regard to prevailing prayer, is given His Church. "Ask and ye shall receive." The Church's mission is Christ's mission, and in that mission, He is not only as deeply interested, but as really engaged as ever. There is an impossibility to separate Christ from His Church. "Ye shall know," said He to His disciples, "that I am in my Father,

and ye in me, and I in you," John 14: 20. St. Paul says to the Ephesians that God "gave Him to be the head over all things to the Church, which is His body, the fullness of Him that filleth all in all," Eph. 1: 22, 23. Christ the head—the Church the body. Therefore Christ's life is the Church's life, and His work the Church's work, which must be carried on after the example left by Him while here in the flesh.

Christ was strengthened for His work through prayer. Before engaging in the toils of the day, and encountering the rude collisions of the world, and the fearful wrecks of sin, He prepared Himself for the task by going into some desert-place to pray. He received "daily bread" from His native heaven, by which He "waxed strong in spirit," and who can tell how much of this was given in answer to earnest prayer? Would the Church of Christ become "mighty through God to the pulling down of strong holds," much prayer, believing prayer, importunate prayer is an absolute necessity.

"Prayer was appointed to convey  
The blessings God designs to give."

Through it the Church is invested with an invincible power. It makes the feeblest strong and the most timid brave. Gideon, and Barak, and Samson, and Jephtha, and David, were indebted to the prayer of faith for their heroism and successes in battle. The first great triumph of the Church, when three thousand slain of the Lord lay in the dust, crying, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" was won in answer to prayer. By mighty pleadings with God, Luther and his coadjutors broke the spell of ages and laid nations subdued at the foot of the cross. Would we see the angel, which has the everlasting gospel to preach, speed his flight, his wings must be strengthened by the Church's prayers. Work must be done, but work alone is insufficient. Jesus worked, but at the same time "offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears." The entire night, before the twelve were chosen, was spent in the mountain in prayer. O that the Church would awake to her great responsibility, that, not only her ministry, but her entire member-

ship, would be found more frequent, more earnest in their prayers for the world's conversion, for then, we might confidently expect the work in which she is engaged to receive a fresh impetus, and the millennial morning to be near at hand!

We fear that the materialistic drift of the age is manifesting itself in the Church, leading many to unduly emphasize work to the neglect of prayer. Luther's motto, "*Ora et labora*," should be the motto of every disciple of Jesus. For the Church in the fulfillment of its mission demands the "*ora*" not less than the "*labora*." Mere human forces, multiplied agencies are not "might nor power" in spiritual work, but an impertinence, unless backed by the Spirit's influences, which we cannot reasonably expect to be done, except there is a compliance with the condition upon which the gift of the Holy Ghost is promised. "If ye being evil know how to give good gifts unto your children; how much more shall the heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask Him?" God is ever willing to give His gracious Spirit, before whose breath the giant Anakim of error and unbelief, of infidelity and heathenism, will flee as chaff before the wings of the wind, but then we must ask, sincerely, believingly ask. Let the Church besiege God's throne with their prayers, and in the might and power of that Spirit which will then be given according to promise, march forth to battle, and the time will draw near when our globe will be brought under the mild sway of "the Prince of Peace," upon whose brow will rest the diadem of victory.

"Jesus shall reign where'er the sun  
Does His successive journeys run;  
His Kingdom stretch from shore to shore  
Till moon shall wax and wane no more."

How grand the mission of the Church! What a noble life to live, in the service of Christ, and for the regeneration of our race! What a sublime death to die, fighting for humanity and truth, laying aside the armor on earth, to wear the crown in heaven!

Soldiers of the cross, the war-bugle is sounding, calling,

*“To arms, to arms!”* Arise, buckle on the divine panoply, unsheathe “the sword of the Spirit,” unfurl the blood-stained banner, and under the leadership of “the Captain of the Lord’s host,” march forth to the moral conquest of the world.

Ambassadors for Christ, by whom God sends His proclamation of pardon to a guilty race, be faithful, be prompt in the delivery of this message of mercy, lest men perish and their blood be required at your hands.

On the Isle of Man, there is said to be an old tower in ruins, moss-covered and ivy-crowned, in the midst of which the most plaintive strains of music are heard at certain times, sung in commemoration of the tragic taking off of one of the governors of that Island. During one of the unhappy wars, in which England was engaged, this governor was charged with treason and condemned to the scaffold. Before the day of execution, his innocence was established, and his monarch thereupon immediately sent him a reprieve. Unfortunately the document fell into the hands of a bitter enemy, who withheld it until after the execution. A pardon was granted, but being withheld, he who should and might have lived, died. Through His Church does the Monarch of the Universe send pardon, not to the innocent, but to the guilty race of men: let the message be carried, and that right speedily to all, by those to whom it is entrusted, lest, through their culpable neglect, souls perish for whom Christ died.

---

## ARTICLE IX.

### LUTHERAN CHURCH POLITY.

We are not ambitious for the last word: but as the writer of the articles in the April and October numbers of the *Review* has completely changed his ground, something more seems necessary to avoid misapprehension, and to vindicate the truth. It will be remembered, that in the article of last January, on *“a question in Church Polity,”* it was proposed *“to exhibit the views of some of our older and most distinguished Lutheran authorities on the subject”* under discussion. As the re-

sult, it was alleged: "*it may be safely affirmed that the Church presents as her faith and practice the examination and ordination of ministers by ministers.*"

In the views set forth in that article, exceptions were taken by Dr. Ort, who undertook to show that we had entirely mistaken the views of our Lutheran divines, and that the very authorities cited prove exactly the contrary of what was affirmed. The discussion is one, therefore, chiefly of Lutheran views and Lutheran usage, and to this point, at least for the present, we propose to confine ourselves.

But we have had so much from the other side about "God-given rights," and have been so frequently reminded of the usurpations of ministers, that we cannot omit a passing notice of these assumptions and imputations. It is a quite common device for men to cover a very shallow foundation by setting up most extravagant claims, and by sounding phrases to seek to divert attention from the weakness of their cause. This claim to a special divine commission, or "God-given rights," is not an uncommon one. We have had it in every age, and from almost every quarter, from without as well as from within the Church, by royal princes and mob leaders, and we are not to be frightened or blinded by any high sounding terms. If these "God-given rights" are to be continually paraded before us in this discussion, we desire to know a little more about them. We very respectfully suggest to those who make such free use of this and similar terms, that it would be well to inform us definitely as to what these "God-given rights" are, and to refer us to the time and place of the grant. Let us have the book, chapter, and verse of the Bible, which contains the charter of this wonderful gift. Surely it must be somewhere definitely recorded, and all the provisions of the grant clearly stated. Meanwhile a few points will be mentioned, in regard to which we are left quite in the dark, and would gladly have some light from those who speak and write so freely on this subject.

Are these "God-given rights" bestowed on all members of the Church, simply as members, or only on true believers?

Do they belong to simple membership in the visible Church, or do they require some spiritual qualification?

Are they bestowed on all, irrespective of age or sex, or, as some churches claim, are they restricted to adult males over twenty-one years of age, and who are not under church censure? Precisely how extensive or how restricted is the grant in this respect?

If they belong to the spiritual priesthood of believers, as such, how are we to ascertain, with absolute certainty, who are spiritual priests, divinely authorized to exercise these rights, and who are only pretenders or impostors in the temple of the Lord?

If the Christian Ministry, or special priesthood, is a mere development, or grows out, of the universal priesthood, or is a power delegated by the universal priesthood to certain individuals, and this right to officiate as ministers of Christ's Church depends entirely on this delegated authority thus bestowed, how would the case stand, if bestowed only by a majority of members of all sorts, and this majority should not include an actual majority of the true believers or spiritual priests in the congregation? Would the authority be delegated or not? Or, if assumed, would the individual thus officiating have authority from the spiritual priesthood, which had refused to grant it?

If these rights are "God-given" to the whole Church (and every member of it), visible or invisible, whence comes the authority to delegate them to a few, or, as we shall see, by and by, according to the doctrine of those who are so loud in asserting the claim, to surrender the grant altogether? Will those who make so much ado over "God-given rights," explain by what process they can be treated as a thing of such utter indifference or worthlessness, that they can advocate the surrender of them at pleasure, or the handing of them over to a few persons appointed by the ruling sovereign? Is that rendering to Caesar the things which are Caesar's, and to God the things which are God's? God-given rights are

after all, held to be very cheap, if they can be delegated or surrendered at pleasure.

These and other questions arise in our minds, when we listen to what is said on the other side, and our difficulties have not been removed by anything offered on this subject from that quarter. We would prefer some clear and satisfactory explanation of the difficulties, which must confront every reflecting mind, when contemplating this view of the Ministry, rather than the repetition of hackneyed terms of vague and doubtful import. And if any one does undertake the task of enlightening us on this point, deemed so fundamental to Lutheranism, we very respectfully suggest that we may be spared hearing again, how 'all the disciples voted to elect Matthias,' when every respectable scholar or careful reader knows, or ought to know, that the choice was by lot, and not by "all voting." We want something better than this "all voting" for Matthias.

We turn now to notice some things in the article in the October number of the REVIEW. The general tone and style of that article invite criticism, but as these are matters of taste, we leave them with the author. We must, however, be allowed to say, that we have not been able to discover any such acquaintance with the authorities he cites, nor any such mastery of the subject under discussion, as to warrant the bold and defiant attitude of the writer. Extravagance of assertion and vehemence of manner are poor substitutes for substantial facts and sober arguments. The one is very apt to be, as in this case, in inverse proportion to the other.

The attention of our readers is called to the fact, that our opponent has entirely changed his position, since he wrote the article in the April number of the REVIEW. He has swung from one extreme to the other, in seeking to maintain his argument. This he has a perfect right to do, if he finds his first position untenable, as he evidently did; and it may indicate some tact in generalship, to abandon an unsafe or dangerous position, and take up another supposed to be safer, but it does not prove a very thorough acquaintance with the field.

In the April number he said: "*The election of a candidate as pastor, was simply the order of the Church to ordain. Bearing this in mind, the statement of the old theologians, that the ministry examined the candidate and ordained, and that the people consented, voted, and approved, becomes very clear.*" The decision of qualifications, and the question of fitness or unfitness, rested with the popular vote of the congregation. And this is the principle, that was to explain and make "very clear" "the statement of the old theologians" on this subject. "Bearing this in mind," he says, "this statement becomes very clear." Unfortunately, it was found that this position contradicted the express and repeated statements of these old theologians on the subject, and when this was pointed out in the July number of the REVIEW, it was quietly abandoned without a word of defence or apology. We hear nothing more about this election of a candidate as pastor being simply the order of the Church to ordain, in the October article. It is hardly necessary for us to say more on this point, as the writer has quietly abandoned it for the opposite extreme.

In the October article, we are informed that this power has been delegated to and vested in the *Consistory*. It is no longer the popular vote, but the vote of a very few individuals, appointed how and for what purpose will be seen presently, that is to decide the matter. From the extremest democracy, we are now carried to the highest style of aristocracy, as the law of the Church, and the exponent of genuine Lutheranism. Dr. Ort seems peculiarly happy in his discovery of the *Consistory*. He is delighted with it above measure, dwells upon it with the most evident satisfaction, and seems to feel assured that now he has found, in these old theologians, something to utterly overthrow this bug-bear of a Ministerium. He is afraid there might be some possible misapprehension in the case, and so says: "Let it be borne distinctly in mind that the Presbytery of which Gerhard and Quenstedt speak, was composed of ministers and highly respected laymen." This is his darling *Consistory*. And he says, with an air of triumphant delight: "If only the laymen could be eliminated from that Presbytery of which Ger-

hard talks so much, and that Quenstedt says was charged with the duty of inquiring into the studies, the character, and the life of those who were to be ordained. But we know of no process of elimination, whether it be that of addition or subtraction, or comparison, or substitution, that will cause these known quantities to disappear utterly."

We do not like to spoil a good thing, and evidently Dr. Ort imagines he has a very good thing. But we must seriously and honestly tell him, that he need not at all trouble himself about getting these laymen out of this Consistory. We knew all the while they were there, and knew by what authority they were there, and are quite willing that he shall have all the benefit that he can legitimately derive from their presence, to support his view of the "God-given rights" of the Church, and of the Lutheran doctrine of the Ministry. It is quite possible, however, that if he had extended his researches beyond "the published translations of Prof. Jacobs and Dr. Hay," he would not have been quite so jubilant over his new discovery of the *Consistory*. We think we shall show, before we are through with this article, that he has allowed himself to be imposed upon by relying too implicitly on partial extracts, severed from their connection; and that his over confident statements about the Presbytery being "composed of both laymen and ministers," in the particular cases cited to prove his doctrine, is simply another unfortunate blunder, like that 'vote of the congregation being the order to ordain?' We regret the necessity of pointing out such blunders, but the style of the discussion on the other side, leaves us no alternative. And if our opponent has not again blundered, so as utterly to mistake the meaning of Gerhard and Quenstedt in the very passages quoted, then we confess that we are unable to read those authors, or have been deceived as to their meaning. Our readers will be furnished with the opportunity of judging who has been mistaken in this case.

As so much stress is laid on the *Consistory*, and what are alleged to be the positive statements of Gerhard and Quenstedt in relation to it and the Presbytery, let us hear Gerhard

on the point of the Consistory, and the examination of candidates for the ministry. He gives a distinct statement covering this very question. We had occasion to refer to Gerhard and this statement in the article of last January, to show that from the very establishment of the Lutheran Church, this practice of ministers examining candidates for the ministry, had been the law or rule of the Church. We cited only a part of what Gerhard says, deeming it quite sufficient for the purpose. Our opponent undertook to show that we misunderstood Gerhard, and that his own views peeped out of every clause of the passage. Assuring him in the July number that his imagination had imposed upon him, and that he was mistaken, he again, in the October number, argues through several pages to show what Gerhard does, or ought to mean. We will now quote enough of the passage from Gerhard to put beyond any shadow of doubt, or ingenuity of logic, the testimony of this distinguished theologian, and let our readers decide whether he assigns the examination of candidates for the ministry to the Consistory, or to the ministers of the Church. Speaking of how the electors, princes, and estates of the Empire, adhering to the Augsburg Confession, and who had secured for themselves in their territories episcopal rights, adjusted these matters, he says:

"Some parts they themselves do not touch, but leave to the MINISTERS OF THE CHURCH, as the preaching of the Word and the administration of the Sacraments, the power of the keys, THE EXAMINATION OF THOSE TO BE ELECTED AS MINISTERS, THEIR ORDINATION, ETC.: some they transact through *Consistories* and *Superintendents*, as the visitation of churches, the decision of ecclesiastical cases, to which especially belong matrimonial affairs, etc.: some they reserve immediately to themselves alone, as the promulgation of ecclesiastical constitutions, the convocation of *Synods*, etc.: some, finally, they administer with the consent of the Church, as the election and calling of ministers."\*

\*Quaedam capita ipsimet non adtingant, sed ecclesiae ministris relinquant, utpote praedicationem verbi et sacramentorum administracionem, potestatem clavium, examen eligendorum ministrorum, eorum ordinacionem, etc: quaedam per consistoriales et superintendentes peragant, utpote ecclesiarum visitationem, causarum ecclesiasti-

Comment upon this quotation from Gerhard seems hardly necessary, and yet our readers are to be persuaded to believe, that Gerhard does not assign the duty of examination to ministers alone, but to Consistories or Presbyteries, meaning, as is alleged, the same, "composed of laymen and ministers." We are told that, "according to the old authorities, there is a wide difference between Ministerium and Presbytery. In the former there are ministers only; in the latter, some are ministers and some are laymen." And the argument is, that to the Presbytery, or Consistory and not to the Ministerium, belongs the right of examining and ordaining. Now we simply ask our readers to note the fact, that Gerhard here makes distinct mention of Consistories, and what was committed to them, and it does *not* include examination or ordination of ministers; also that he mentions what was left in the hands of the ministers of the Church, and it *does* include this very duty. No argument can make this testimony of Gerhard clearer, and no sophistry or ingenuity can explain it away. There it stands, itself a sufficient refutation of the specious logic employed to prove by this author the very contrary. Whatever may have been done afterwards, and whatever authority Consistories may have usurped, from the beginning of Lutheranism it was not so. At that time it is clear, on the express authority of Gerhard, that these Consistories did not examine, but the Ministerium or ministers did. Will our opponent make a note of this?

As the *Consistories* are relied on to overthrow the *Ministerium*, it may be well to inquire a little into their origin and character. The whole subject is somewhat confused and perplexing, as they did not have a very fixed character, but differed at different times and in different places. Some general features, however, are sufficiently established to be considered parts of the system.

---

carum, ad quas etiam matrimoniales spectant, dijudicationem, etc.; quaedam sibi solis immediate reservent, utpote constitutionum ecclesiistarum promulgationem, synodorum convocationem, etc.: quaedam deinde cum consensu ecclesiae administrent, utpote electionem et vocationem ministrorum.—Vol. XII., p. 116.

1. When first established they had no reference to the examination or ordination of ministers, but were for a wholly different object. In the Appendix to the Smalcald Articles, the need was pointed out of a court to have jurisdiction in matters relating to marriage. Accordingly, the first Consistory was established at Wittenberg, composed of two ministers and two laymen, "to have jurisdiction in matrimonial affairs only." Others were afterwards established, and their powers were somewhat varied; but in no case was their business purely ecclesiastical or spiritual. They had jurisdiction in secular as well as in ecclesiastical affairs, and the claim was distinctly put forward and acknowledged, that they represented the State as well as the Church.

2. The members of the Consistories were appointed by the ruling sovereign or prince, and the Churches had no voice in their selection. No congregations delegated to them any authority to act in their name, nor were they even consulted in their appointment. The head of the government acted on his own authority in the matter, claiming, it is true, to be the ecclesiastical as well as the civil head of the government.

3. They did not in any true or proper sense represent the Church, or constitute the *Church representative*. We know very well that Gerhard, Quenstedt, and others, speak of them in this light, to support the figment of a theory of the "*ecclesia repreaesentativa*." But the plainest facts contradict the theory, and the authorities frankly admit that the Consistories represent no one but the head of the government. Buddeus says:

"There are some who designate Consistories by the name of the *Church representative*, which, nevertheless if you judge the matter correctly, rather than the Church, represent the prince himself, or the sovereign ruler, by whose command they administer the law in regard to sacred things." \*

The best authorities tell us, that the "members of the Con-

\* *Sunt et qui Consistoria, ecclesiae repreaesentativa nomine designant; quae tamen, si adequare rem dijudices, ipsum principem potius, seu summum imperantem, cuius mandato jus circa Sacra administrant, quam ecclesiam, repreasentant.*—Buddeus, pp. 1214.

sistories were regarded as mere servants of the State." The theologians indeed try to harmonize this State agency, consisting of a few individuals from the State and the Church, with the doctrine of a *Church representative*, composed of ministers and laymen, truly representing the Church. But it is a very lame affair.

4. These Consistories, so far as they acted for the churches, saved them all trouble in electing pastors, and left them only the negative right of objecting to their appointments, on sufficient cause being shown; but of this the Consistories were the judge, and if they judged the objection to be "frivolous, without honorable cause from ignorance or caprice," they are "to pay no heed to it," so that practically the congregations had few if any rights left, where these State agencies, representing the prince, administered Church affairs.

Such, in brief, were the Consistories, when they undertook to regulate and control such matters as our opponent seems delighted to find in their power. Appointed by the prince, acting by authority of the prince, really the agents of the prince, when they usurped the rights which belonged to the ministers and members of the Church, they left little but tame submission to their authority.

But this was in violation of the original design of Consistories, and, as we learn, "destroyed the independence of the Church, degraded it to a mere institution of the State, and withdrew all participation in the government of the Church from the congregations." This is the Consistory, let it be remembered, which our opponent so lauds, because it had in it a few laymen, appointed by the sovereign to represent him, and which he thinks so superior to a body of Lutheran ministers.

That such exercise of authority by the Consistory, in examining and deciding on ministerial qualifications, as claimed by our opponent, was in violation of clearly defined consistorial law, can be easily shown. That it was in opposition to the order established in the Church after the peace of Passau, as distinctly stated by Gerhard, has already been proved by the clearest testimony. The learned Carpov, Professor of

jurisprudence, who has written a ponderous work on *ecclesiastical or consistorial jurisprudence*, has stated the case in terms sufficiently clear. He says:

"But truly, indeed, must we distinguish between ecclesiastical authority, *internal*, and *external*: the former, which truly consists in the preaching of the word, the administration of the sacraments, and the power of the keys, and concerns the ministry itself, is left to the ministry of the Church, nor can the princes and civil authorities intrude themselves into it."\*

Again, and most decisively:

"Whether, therefore, shall all these causes, and the entire episcopal rights be discussed and acted on in the Consistories? This certainly is not to be affirmed, lest we extend the jurisdiction of Consistories too far, and erroneously confound the internal ecclesiastical authority with the external: for what relates to the preaching of the word, the administration of the sacraments, and the power of the keys, and *the ministry itself*, into these the princes and civil authorities ought by no means to intrude themselves; and so NEITHER SHOULD THE CONSISTORIES WHO HAVE OBTAINED THEIR POWER OF JUDGING FROM THEM. But they should stop with those things which belong to the external authority of the Church."†

Here the distinction is clearly drawn between the internal, and the external, authority of the Church, and the principle laid down that the Consistories have no right to interfere in the internal affairs, or what belongs to the ministerial office. That this includes the examination and ordination of minis-

\* Sed nimur probe distinguendum est inter potestatem Ecclesiasticam internam et externam: illa, quae nempe consistit in praedicatione verbi, administratione Sacramentorum, et potestate clavium, ipsumque respicit ministerium, Ecclesiae ministris relinquitur, nec possunt Principes et Status politici se huic intromittere.—*Jurisprud. Consistorialis*, Lib. I. p. 4.

† Annum ergo omnes hae causae ac universa jura episcopalia in Consistoriis ventilanda atque tractanda erunt? Non certe asserendum, ne jurisdictionem Consistoriorum nimium extendamus, et potestatem ecclesiasticae internam cum externa perperam confundamus: Nam quae praedicationem verbi, administrationem Sacramentorum et potestatem Clavium, ipsumque Ministerium respiciunt, iis Principes et Magistratus politici nequaquam se intromittere debent, adeoque nec Consistoria, qui ab illis potestatem judicandi obtinuerunt. Sed subsistendum in eis quae externae sunt potestatis ecclesiasticae.—*Jurisprud. Consistorialis*, Lib. III., p. 656.

ters, he further distinctly states, when showing the disposition made by the elector and princes of what are called episcopal rights, after the peace of Passau. He says:

“Some things they leave to the ministers of the Church, as the preaching of the word, the administration of the sacraments, the power of the keys, the examination of those to be elected as ministers, and their ordination, **BECAUSE THESE HAVE REGARD TO THE INTERNAL AUTHORITY OF THE CHURCH**, from which they properly abstain, as we have said above.”\*

Further, tersely and sharply:

“The ecclesiastical estate (ministry) examines, ordains, installs.”†

Language could hardly be plainer than this, in declaring that the Consistories have no right to interfere in the examination and ordination of ministers, but that this work belongs to the ministers of the Church. And this is from one whose office, as Chancellor of the Elector of Saxony, was to expound the law on the subject in that home of Lutheranism. The advocates of the Ministerium, to-day, say just what these learned Lutheran authorities say, that the examination and ordination of ministers belong to the ministers of the Church, and that others ought by no means to intrude upon this business—nequaquam se intromittere debent. If this be “episcopal debris which has been dumped there from the cart of ministerial self-perpetuation,” it has the sanction and support of the founders of the Lutheran Church, and her greatest theologians and jurists.

How Luther himself regarded these *Consistories*, which were introduced only a few years before his death, and which already began to interfere with the rights and duties of ministers, a few of his characteristic utterances well show; and it will be seen that his admiration for them was not quite equal

\* Quaedam \* \* Ecclesiae ministris relinquat, puta praedicationem verbi et Sacramentorum administrationem, potestatem Clavium, examen eligendorum ministrorum, eorumque ordinationem, quia haec spectant ad internam potestatem ecclesiasticam, a qua merito abstinent, ut diximus, supr. libr. 1. Definit. 2.

† Status ecclesiasticus examinat, ordinat, instituit. — Jurisprud. Consistorialis, Lib. III., p. 656.

to that of some of our modern defenders of these exponents of genuine Lutheranism. He declares:

“We must pull down the Consistory, if we would not soon have the jurists and the pope in it.”

Against the interference with the rights and duties of ministers by others, he says:

“Either let them themselves become pastors, preach, baptize, visit the sick, administer the communion, and perform all ecclesiastical duties, or let them cease to confound callings, let them attend to their courts, and leave the churches to those who are called to them, and who must render an account to God.”

Again:

“The court isn’t worth anything. Its regiment is mere crabs and snails.” \* \* “It has come to this—that we see young masters, cities, even small muddy towns and villages, that would prevent their pastors and preachers from inveighing against sin and crime, in the pulpit, or else chase them away and starve them; and he that takes anything from them is holy. If they complain to the officials, they are called so ambitious that nothing can satisfy them.”

These are the Consistories, and these are the laymen, whose presence and aid we are assured are so necessary in the examination of ministers, to keep down ministerial arrogance, and to protect the Church against the encroachments of priestly authority. Perhaps we shall be told that there is no such danger in our day, and that the like cannot occur in this country, where there is no such union of Church and State. But we reply, that the danger is quite as great in that direction as in the opposite, where so much fear and alarm are continually expressed by the enemies of the Ministerium. Ministers of Jesus Christ are not necessarily “sinners above all others,” and the least of all worthy of confidence and trust. If they cannot be trusted in this matter, the sooner they abandon their calling, the better for themselves, and for those who are ambitious to assume these responsibilities.

We must now notice the argument, in the October number, based on the *Consistory* and *Presbytery* being the same, and their being “composed of both laymen and ministers;” whilst

the Ministerium "has no laymen in it." This is really the main point in that article, and it is very apparent that the author imagines he has made out a case that admits of no reply. He dwells upon this point, and reiterates his assertions with a confidence that can only be explained by the supposition, that he is entirely innocent of any examination of Gerhard and Quenstedt themselves, but has derived all his knowledge of them from a few brief quotations. He says:

"\*Let it be borne distinctly in mind that the Presbytery, of which Gerhard and Quenstedt speak, was composed of ministers and highly respected laymen." \* \* "According to these old authorities, there is a wide difference between Ministerium and Presbytery. In the former there are ministers only; in the latter, some are ministers and some are laymen." \* \* "And what is the Presbytery? Gerhard and Quenstedt define it to be an ecclesiastical body, composed of ministers and laymen."

Now in the face of these very positive and unqualified assertions, and of the boastful logic based on them, we venture to affirm that both Gerhard and Quenstedt do use the term Presbytery when no laymen are included, and simply to designate a ministerial body. We will not imitate his valor, and "challenge our opponent to cite from Gerhard a passage which gives any other" meaning, for we do not claim to have read every sentence in Gerhard; but we will undertake to show that "according to these old authorities," so far from there *always* being "*a wide difference between Ministerium and Presbytery*," they use the term Presbytery, over and over again, to express the very idea of Ministerium, or body of ministers. And if we shall succeed in showing this—and showing, too, that this is the case in the very connections from which the passages have been wrested to prove the contrary—the labored reasoning and vehement rhetoric of our opponent, will have served but little purpose, except to gratify those who love their own opinions more than the truth, and who would sooner cling to a delusion, than experience the discomfort of acknowledging an error. It is not pre-

tended that these old divines never use the term Presbytery in a sense that includes laymen, nor that they have not sometimes used it in the same sense as Consistory ; but that this is not its only meaning, nor the common meaning when they use it in connection with examination and ordination of ministers. This is the real question. A word may have more than one use or signification, and its use in any given case is the important point in ascertaining the meaning of an author. The word *πρεσβύτερον*, occurs three times in our Greek Testament, translated differently each time. Was the body that laid hands on Timothy to ordain him, 1 Tim. 4:14, the same that joined the chief priests and scribes to lead Jesus into their council, Luke 22:66? The inspired writers use the same word, and that word in Greek is *Presbytery*. If Presbytery can have but one meaning, and that meaning such as is assigned it in the October REVIEW, then it can do very strange things—even more strange than that writer himself claims.

The very first quotation used from Gerhard, in the October Article, if the writer had examined the connection, would have saved him from falling into, and us the necessity of pointing out, this mistake. Just before, Gerhard says :

“Moreover, since there are in the Church three distinct Estates or orders: the *ecclesiastical*, the *political*, and the *domestic*, or the *Presbytery*, the *magistracy*, and the *people*, of all which, as members, the Church consists, etc.” \*

No one, acquainted with Gerhard and our Lutheran theologians, will question that by *status ecclesiasticus* here, he means the ministry, and yet he puts as the synonym *Presbytery*. And so he continues to use it again and again throughout the connection. He says:

“*For since those who are already engaged in the ministry, and profess sound doctrine, are of all able to judge most correctly concerning the qualifications of those who are to be called to the office*

\**Porro cum in ecclesia sint tres distincti status sive ordines: ecclesiasticus, politicus, et oeconomicus, sive presbyterium, magistratus et populus, ex quibus omnibus, velut ex membris, ecclesia constat etc.*

of teaching, therefore no one will say that they should be excluded from the mediate calling. But because the *Presbytery* is not the whole Church, but only a part, etc." \*

Here again, it will be observed, he uses *Presbytery* as meaning the same with "*those already engaged in the ministry*." Then follows the quotation given in the October number, where again it is plain that he uses *Presbytery* for ministers or *status ecclesiasticus*—"not to the *Presbytery* alone, nor to the *magistracy* alone, much less to the \* \* \* promiscuous and ignorant multitude etc." † And right on, in the same paragraph, he says: "*To the Presbytery belong the examination, ordination and installation*" ‡.

It seems like a waste of time and space to argue that here Gerhard by the term *Presbytery* means the ministry. He uses it in apposition to, or as the synonym of, *status ecclesiasticus*, which denotes the ministry. To it he assigns not only the examination, but the ordination and installation of ministers, duties which confessedly belong to ministers. If any doubt on this point, the simple reading of Gerhard will be sufficient to remove their difficulties.

In the next quotation, furnished on the same page in the October REVIEW, in reply to Bellarmine, where the writer treats us to stars, \* \* \* Gerhard, in the words omitted, speaks distinctly of the "examination by the ministry"—*examinatum a ministerio*, and then proceeds to use *presbytery* in the same sense, as the connection clearly shows. Why these stars were used, instead of Gerhard's own plain words, our readers can readily surmise.

Further proof of our point might be furnished from Gerhard, but it is deemed unnecessary. Enough has been cited to show that he uses *Presbytery* for the *status ecclesiasticus*.

\* Qui enim jam ante versantur, in ministerio, et profitentur sanam doctrinam, omnium rectissime de eorum, qui ad docendi munus vocandi sunt, qualitatibus judicare possunt, nemo igitur dixerit, eos a vocatione mediata excludendos esse. Quia vero presbyterium non est tota ecclesia, sed tantum pars ejus etc.

† Nec soli presbyterio, nec soli magistratu multo minus arbitrio promiscuae et imperitiae multitudinis subjiciendam esse ministrorum constitutionem etc.

‡ Presbyterio competit examen, ordinatio it inauguratio.

or ministry, and that to this he assigns the duty of examination and ordination. What he says about Consistories, and the use made of it by our opponent, will be noticed before we close. In the October Article, some stress is laid on the fact that Gerhard says: *in examine non satisfecerit presbyteri expectationi*, instead of *ministerii*. But as we have shown that Gerhard uses Presbytery in such connections for ministry; and as he does expressly use *ministerio*, where stars are substituted in that quotation, the objection must be felt to be very weak.

But we are assured that: "Quenstedt, without vagueness, without obscurity of language, declares, that the Consistory, which is composed of ministers and highly respected members of the Church, 'is charged with the duty of inquiring into the studies, the life, and the character of those who are to be ordained.'"

Now if this very formal and positive assertion has any real meaning, or application to the point under discussion, it must mean that "Quenstedt without vagueness, without obscurity of language," assigns to the Consistory, composed of ministers and laymen, the duty of examining and deciding upon the qualifications of candidates for the ministry. But we think we shall show by Quenstedt's own very express language that this is not the case, and that our opponent has again been drawn into a mistake, by relying on partial quotations from Quenstedt, instead of examining for himself. To make good our statement it will be necessary to quote at some length from Quenstedt. In entire agreement with Gerhard, he says:

"The Church consists of three parts, 1. The bishops and presbyters, 2. the magistrates, and 3. the common people: or, the Presbytery, the magistracy, and the people, of all which as members, the Church consists. No one of these estates is to be excluded from this work, but to each is to be left its own parts and its own duties in the mediate calling of ministers. The first parts belong to the bishops and presbyters, the second to the civil magistracy, but, thirdly, also there is required the suffrage and sanction of the Christian people."

"Each part of the Church has its own duties in the calling of ministers: *It is the part of ministers to examine the candidates for the ministry, to inquire into their learning and life, to ascertain and judge of the gifts necessary to the ministerial office, and to ordain them by the laying on of hands.*" \* \* \*

"A distinction is to be made between the right of calling, and the ceremony of ordination; the one belongs to the whole Church, the other to the Presbytery alone." \*

On this quotation from Quenstedt, we remark, 1. That it shows that he also uses the term Presbytery to mean the ministry, and not the Consistory, in such connection. This is evident from his using it as the synonym of bishops and presbyters, or as the first part or the Church, which he had just stated to include sacerdotes sive statum ecclesiasticum; and also from his assigning to it alone the ceremony of ordination—ritum ordinationis. All Lutherans of all shades assign this duty to the ministry. 2. That he does, "without vagueness, without obscurity of language," declare that to the ministers, sacerdotum, and not to the Consistory, belongs the duty of examining candidates for the ministry, and judging of their qualifications, as well as that of ordination.

So that Quenstedt, as well as Gerhard, teaches the very opposite of what our opponent, so confidently and so boldly affirmed touching the Presbytery and the duty of examining candidates for the ministry. Their plain language is not to be set aside by part of a sentence taken here, and part there, and so fitted together as to make them mean some-

\* Ecclesia tribus constat partibus, 1. Episcopis et Presbyteris. 2. Magistratibus et. 3. rudi plebe: Sive, Presbyterio, Magistratu, et populo, ex quibus omnibus, velut ex membris, Ecclesia consistit. Nullus horum Statuum ab hoc opere est excludendus, sed singulis suae partes, suaque officia in mediata vocatione Ministrorum sunt relinquenda. Primae partes debentur Episcopis et Presbyteris, secundae Magistratui seculari, sed et tertio requiritur populi Christiani suffragium et testimonium.

Quaelibet Ecclesiae pars in vocandis Ministris suas habet functiones; Sacerdotum est, candidatos ministerii examinare. in eruditionem et vitam eorum inquirire, de donis ad Ministerium Ecclesiasticum necessariis, cognoscere et judicare, cum impositione manuum eos inauguare; etc.

Disting, inter jus vocationis, et ritum ordinationis: illud competit toti ecclesiae, hoc soli Presbyterio.—Quenstedt vol. IV. p. 402.

thing entirely different from what they actually say. Having paid some little attention to what they have to say on this subject, we very respectfully invite Dr. Ort to furnish a single statement from Gerhard, or Quenstedt, that, fairly interpreted, assigns to Consistories the duty of examining candidates and deciding upon their qualifications. That the quotations he has used for this purpose, utterly fail to support such a view, we think has been shown beyond the shadow of a doubt: and we have furnished express and repeated statements from these authors, showing that they do assign this duty to ministers, designating them by a variety of such terms as admit of no debate as to their meaning.

And now a word about those Consistories, of which both Gerhard and Quenstedt do speak, and speak very sparingly—not “*talk so much*,” as we are assured in the October article—and which they do call Presbyteries. We think it has been shown from their own express language, that our opponent has egregiously mistaken their meaning, when he asserts that they use the term Presbytery as entirely different from Ministerium. But that they also sometimes use the word in the same sense as Consistory, we do not at all question. The connection will generally readily decide the specific meaning; but, unfortunately, in the October REVIEW, the writer paid no regard to the connection, but argued because it sometimes meant Consistory, and included laymen and ministers, it always means this, and nothing else. The few paragraphs he quotes can be readily explained in harmony with what they say of the duty of ministers, to examine and ordain, and without making Gerhard and Quenstedt contradict themselves. Let us now inquire into their actual meaning.

Gerhard is arguing the right of the people, or members of the Church, to have a part in the general business of calling or electing ministers. He has just declared the duty of the ministry to examine—ministerio, ut eligendae personae doctrinam et qualitates exploret—and now he is speaking of how the people may express their judgment, or perform their part. He says:

"The practice of our churches shows, that without confusion the people are admitted to the election of ministers. There have been established among us Consistories, composed of highly respectable ecclesiastical and political persons, who represent the Church, nor does the whole multitude of the people participate in the election, but to certain persons, *viz.*, elders, the authority is given of speaking and acting in the name of the rest."

In this he cannot have any reference to the examination of the candidates, for he has just said, in this same paragraph, and with only a single sentence intervening, "to each order of the Church we assign its own part: *to the ministry that it may examine into the doctrine and qualifications of the person to be elected.*"\* This, therefore, is plainly not the point; but it is the vote of the people in the election: and this, he says, is done, without confusion, by "certain persons," elders, or the Consistory, speaking and acting in the name of the rest. This is something quite different from the formal examination, which he distinctly assigns to ministers, in this same statement—but which was entirely overlooked in the October article in the REVIEW.

And so with the quotations from Quenstedt, imagined to be so conclusive. Two quotations, considerably separated in Quenstedt, are brought together, and the attempt made to prove that this author expressly assigns the duty of examination to the Consistory. The first quotation, and the one relied on to support the conclusion, immediately follows those already given in this article from Quenstedt. After expressly, and with a clearness that leaves no possible room for doubt as to his meaning, assigning to ministers the duty of examining and deciding upon the qualifications of candidates—*Sacerdotum est, candidatos ministerii examinare, in eruditionem et vitam eorum inquirere, de donis ad Ministerium Ecclesiasticum necessariis, cognoscere et judicare*—he states, very much as Gerhard has done:

"To avoid contentions in the election of bishops and pres-

---

\* *Et cuique ecclesiae ordini suas partes adsignamus: ministrio, ut eligendae personae doctrinam et qualitates exploret.*

byters, there have rightly been established Church Consistories, or Presbyteries, composed of ecclesiastical and honorable political men, who represent the Church, and whose duty it is to further ecclesiastical business, and to inquire into the studies, life and character of those to be ordained to the ministry.”\*

In ascertaining his meaning, it is to be assumed that he does not intend to contradict himself in what he had just stated in the sentences immediately preceding, about the duty of ministers to examine and ordain. The specific point in the statement is “the avoiding of contentions in elections”—*Ad praecavendas contentiones in electione*—which is a matter wholly different from that of the examination of candidates, where there is little room for contentions. And to avoid these, as Gerhard tells us, not “the whole multitude of the people” vote, but only “certain persons” representing the Church: and these same persons, called the Consistory, Quenstedt says, should inquire into—literally “ought to inquire,” *inquirere debent*,—the studies, life, and character of those to be ordained to the ministry.” When speaking of the duty of ministers to examine, etc., he uses *examinare—cognoscere et judicare*, but of the Consistory he simply says, *inquirere debent*. This distinction in the use of words is not accidental, but shows what each of them was to do—the ministers were to examine and judge of ministerial qualifications, the Consistory, doing the voting in election, were also in behalf of those they represented, to inquire into the fitness of those to be elected and ordained. Such a fair interpretation puts these theologians in harmony with themselves and the facts in the case: and if it be remembered, that at that time, no one was ordained without a call to some church, the significance of this election by the Consistory can be readily understood.

There are some other incidental points that we would like

---

\* *Ad praecavendas contentiones in Episcoporum et Presbyterorum electione, recte instituta sunt Consistoria Ecclesiastica, sive Presbyteria, ex viris Ecclesiasticis et honoratis Politicis, qui Ecclesiam repraesentant, et negotia Ecclesiastica expedire, atque in studia, vitam, ac mores ordinandorum ad ministerium inquirere debent.*—**QUENSTEDT**, Vol. IV., 402.

to discuss, but for the present we have neither time nor space. To one only can we refer, and that in the briefest manner. The attempt has been made to create the impression, that the advocates of the Ministerium are seeking to uphold a doctrine unfriendly to the rights of the laity and of the churches, and opposed to genuine Lutheranism. It has been alleged that the Missourians, assumed to be the most genuinely Lutheran of all our Lutheran bodies, maintain and practice the same views as our opponents. On the contrary, we boldly affirm, that no part of the Lutheran Church has ever accorded to the laity and churches a fuller measure of their just rights, than those in the General Synod, who are most zealous in their defence of the Ministerium. And so far from the Missourians granting greater freedom to their congregations, we speak advisedly when we say, that under this principle of delegated authority, advocated by our opponents, their ministers meet in ministerial Conferences, and enact rules for the churches, such as no Ministerium in the General Synod would attempt to do. They are greatly deceived, who imagine that the denial to the ministry of their just rights is the proper way to secure the rights of the churches. This war upon the Ministerium, is radical in its spirit, revolutionary in its character, and destructive in its tendency. It has been uniformly marked by innuendoes or flings against the character of the ministry, and the danger of intrusting to them such grave responsibilities, forgetting that the degradation of the ministry must carry with it the degradation of the whole Church.

A few points, it is believed, have been established beyond any reasonable controversy. 1. That in the original establishment of the Lutheran Church, the duty of examination, judging of qualifications, and ordaining to the office of the ministry, was committed to ministers of the gospel.

2. That this rule received the sanction of the highest authorities, both among the theologians and jurists of the Lutheran Church, as the law of the Lutheran Church.

3. That when our fathers organized the Church in this country, they recognized and adopted the same principle, and handed it down to their successors.

4. That the founders and defenders of our General Synod adopted the same as a part of Lutheran Church polity.

It is a sufficient answer to the question of our opponent: "does this 'time-honored practice' prove that the Lutheran Church in this country judged the making of ministers to belong by divine appointment exclusively to the ministry?" to quote from the Formula of Government recommended to Synods—"The clergy shall then hold a meeting, consisting exclusively of Scripture elders, that is preachers, for the purpose of attending to those duties *which Christ and His apostles enjoined upon them alone, etc.*"

This view of Church polity we have endeavored to defend, believing it to be not only Lutheran, but scriptural. We believe that the honor of the ministry, and the welfare of the churches are concerned in its maintenance; and so long as we have the honor to belong to the one, and labor for the other, we hope to be loyal to this principle of our Evangelical Lutheran Church.

---

## ARTICLE X.

### LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

As usual during the last quarter of the year, holiday books have been filling a prominent place in publishers' catalogues. They are of small account, however, in any record meant to present the progress of original literary work. Many of them are beautiful exhibitions of the publisher's art, but they do not come within the meaning of our quarterly lists.

**BIBLICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.**—*The Christian Faith, an Exposition of the Apostles' Creed*, by Rev. Geo. M. Baker, Rector of St. James' Church, Batavia; *The True Man*, and other Practical Sermons, by Rev. Samuel S. Mitchell, D. D.; *The Teachings of Providence, or New Lessons on Old Subjects*, by Rev. J. B. Gross, author of "The Doctrine of the Lord's Supper;" *The Vision of God, and other Sermons*, by Rev. Henry Allon, D. D., Pastor of the Union Chapel, Islington, Editor of the British Quarterly Review; *A Young Man's Difficulties with his Bible*, by Rev. D. W. Faunce, author of Fletcher Prize Essay, "The Christian World;" *Why Four Gospels*, or the Gospel for

all the World, a Manual designed to aid Christians in the Study of the Scriptures, and to a better understanding of the Gospels, by S. D. Gregory, D. D., Professor of the Mental Sciences and English Literature in the University of Wooster, author of "Christian Ethics;" *Modern Materialism, etc.*, Attitude towards Theology, comprising two Papers reprinted from the "Contemporary Review," and being a Continuation of the Argument of "Religion as affected by Modern Materialism," by James Martineau, LL. D.; *The Meaning and Power of Baptism*, by Rev. J. G. Stearns; *Lange's Commentary*, a new vol., *Ezekiel*, translated, Enlarged and Edited by Patrick Fairburn, D. D. and Rev. Wm. Findlay, aided by Rev. Thomas Crerar, M. A., and Rev. Sinclair Mansen—*Daniel*, translated, enlarged, and edited by James Strong, S. T. D.; *Christ, the Teacher of Men*, by Rev. A. W. Pitzer, author of "Ecce Deus-Homo;" *The Book of Psalms*, a new translation, with Introduction and Notes Explanatory and Critical, by J. J. Stewart Browne, reprinted from the third English Edition, by W. F. Draper; *In the Days of thy Youth*, by F. W. Farrar, D. D.

**PHILOSOPHICAL AND SCIENTIFIC.**—*The Theory of Sound in its Relation to Music*, by Prof. Pietro Blaserna, of the Royal University of Rome, with numerous wood-cuts, (International Scientific Series); *Contemporary Evolution*, an Essay on some recent Social Changes, by St. George Mivart; *Modern Physical Fatalism and the Doctrine of Evolution*, by Thomas Rawson Birks, M. A.; *Outlines of Lectures on the History of Philosophy*, by John J. Elmendorf, S. T. D.; *The Races of Man and their Geographical Distribution*, from the German of Oscar Peschel; *History of Thought in the Eighteenth Century*, by Leslie Stephens, two vols., large octavo; *The Development Hypothesis—Is it Sufficient?* by James McCosh, D. D., LL. D., President of Princeton College.

**POLITICAL.**—*The Money Question*—the Legal-Tender Paper Monetary System of the United States, by Wm. A. Berkey; *Archology*, or the Science of Government, by S. V. Blakeslee, Oakland, Cal.; *An Alphabet in Finance*, a Simple Statement of Permanent Principles and their Application to Questions of the Day, by Graham McAdam, with Introduction by R. R. Bowker.

**HISTORICAL AND BIOGRAPHICAL.**—*The Life of (John) Conrad Weiser*, the German Pioneer, Patriot, and Patron of Two Races, by C. Z. Weiser, D. D.; *The Early Plantagenets*, by Wm. Stubbs, M. A., Regius Prof. of Modern History in the University of Oxford; (*Epochs of Modern History*, edited by Edward E. Morris, M. A., and J. Surtees Phillpotts, B. C. L.); *Viking Tales of the North*, translated from the Icelandic by Rasmus B. Anderson—See notice in this number of REVIEW; *The Life of John Locke*, by H. R. Fox Bourne, two vols.; *Lectures on the History of Preaching*, by John A. Broadus, D. D., LL. D., Prof. in the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Green-

ville, S. C., author of "A Treatise on the Preparation and Delivery of Sermons;" *Centennial Historical Discourses* delivered in the city of Philadelphia, June, 1876, by appointment of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States—with the Moderator's Sermon before the General Assembly of 1876—by Rev. A. T. McGill, D. D., LL. D., Rev. S. M. Hopkins, D. D., Rev. S. J. Willson, D. D., LL.D., Rev. E. P. Humphrey, D. D., LL. D., Rev. E. D. Morris, D. D.; *The Athenean Empire*, from the Flight of Xerxes to the Fall of Athens, by Geo. W. Cox, M. A. (Epochs of Ancient History, edited by Rev. G. W. Cox, M. A., and Charles Sankey, M. A.)

**POETRY**—*Deirdre*, an anonymous poem; *Fridthjof's Saga*, a Norse Romance, by Esaias Tegner, Bishop of Wexio, translated from the Swedish by Thomas E. A. Holcomb and Martha A. Lyon Holcomb.

**MISCELLANEOUS**.—*Diamonds and Precious Stones*, a Popular account of Gems, translated from the French of Louis Dieulafait, by Fanchon Sanford (Illustrated Library of Wonders); *Vine and Olive*, or Young America in Spain and Portugal; a Story of Travel and Adventure, by Wm. F. Adams (Oliver Optic); *Rules for Conducting Business in Deliberative Assemblies*, by P. H. Mell, D. D., new edition revised; *In the Levant*, by Chas. W. Warner; *King Saul*, a Tragedy, by Byron A. Brooks.

#### GERMAN.

**BIBLICAL**.—On the Gospel of John a new work of 595 pp. has appeared, from the pen of a layman, F. von Uechtritz. The title is: "Studies of a layman on the Origin, the Character, and the Significance of the Gospel of John."

On the Apocalypse there is a new commentary, by Prof. Dr. A. Bisping, 356 pp. It seems to be rather a reproduction of what other commentators have said, than an original exposition.

**SYSTEMATIC**.—The second edition of the learned work of Dr. Kahn's, on *Lutheran Dogmatics*, has been published. The work has been thoroughly revised and considerably changed, though the author's standpoint is the same as in the first edition. Whilst the first edition appeared in three volumes, the second has but two, of 518 and 530 pp. The historico-genetic method, which was severely attacked by critics, has been retained.

**HISTORICAL**.—*History of quietistic Mysticism in the Catholic Church*, by Dr. H. Heppe, 522 pp. He speaks only of the Mysticism in the Catholic Church since the Reformation, beginning with the Spanish Quietism of the sixteenth century. The book consists of eight sections, nearly six of which are devoted to Madam Guyon. In an appendix he speaks briefly of the quietistic Mysticism in the Protestant Church.

Of the recent German works on Mysticism, one of the most learned

is that of Prof. Preger on the *History of German Mysticism in the Middle Ages*. Part I. contains the history of German Mysticism till the time of Master Eckhart's death, 488 pp. The volume is divided into three sections. In the first he discusses Mystic life in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries; in the second, The Mystic Doctrines before Master Eckhart; in the third, he treats of Master Eckhart.

*The Apostle Barnabas*, by Dr. O. Braunsberger, 278 pp. This is the work of a Catholic priest, and from the Catholic standpoint. It received the prize offered by the theological Faculty of the University of Munich. While learned, and showing great research, it is not as critical as some other works on the subject, not distinguishing carefully enough between legend and history. It is divided into two parts; first, The life of the Apostle Barnabas; second, The Epistle of Barnabas.

*Lectures on Church History and on the History of the Christian life in the Church*, by R. Rothe. Edited by Prof. Weingarten. Two parts, 492 and 555 pp. The first part treats of the Catholic or churchly period, the second of the Catholic and Protestant period. Some of the peculiar views of Rothe, found in his Ethics, are also found in these lectures, especially his peculiar view of the relation of the Church to the State. His division is also peculiar. He regards the time from the beginning of the Christian Church till the Reformation as the Catholic or churchly period; the second period begins with the Reformation, and he calls this the civil, worldly, moral, or political period. The first period he subdivides as follows: first, to the time of Constantine; second, to the time of Charlemagne; third, to the Reformation.

**MISCELLANEOUS.**—*Miscellaneous Lectures on Christian Life in the past and present*, by Dr. Uhlhorn, 410. The lectures are on the period of the Reformation, on the Vatican Council, on social questions, and one on Thomas a Kempis.

*Posthumous Lectures on Liturgics and Homiletics*, by Dr. Henke. Edited by Dr. Zschimmer, 572 pp. The work is divided as follows: after the Introduction, part first treats of Cultus in general, part second of Liturgics, part third of Homiletics. In Liturgics he generally adopts the views of Lutheran theologians.

On Social Science two works have recently appeared, but neither of them based on the principles of the Gospel. *Structure and Life of the Social Body*, by Dr. Schaeffer. First volume, 850 pp. *Thoughts on the Social Science of the Future*, by P. Lilienfeld. Second part, 464 pp.

J. H. W. S.

## ARTICLE XI.

## NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

J. B. LIPPINCOTT &amp; CO., PHILA.

(For sale by A. D. Buehler &amp; Co., Gettysburg, Pa.)

*A Commentary, Critical, Experimental, and Practical, on the Old and New Testaments*, by the Rev. Robert Jamison, D. D., St. Paul's, Glasgow; Rev. A. R. Fausset, A. M., St. Cuthbert's, York; and Rev. David Brown, D. D., Professor of Theology, Aberdeen. Vol. VI. Acts—Romans. By the Rev. David Brown, D. D. 1 Corinthians—Revelations. By the Rev. A. R. Fausset, A. M. pp. xxiv., lxxii., 731.

This is the concluding volume of this valuable Commentary. The preceding volumes have been noticed in the REVIEW, and the favorable judgment already expressed is reiterated. Its character is well expressed in the title, "Critical, Experimental and Practical." The authors have availed themselves of the best modern critical aids in ascertaining the true meaning of the text, and from it have derived the lessons bearing on religious experience, and the practical duties of holy living. These six volumes, at a moderate cost, furnish an immense amount of valuable matter bearing on the Bible, and the various subjects included in the sacred volume. Any individual or family possessing this work will have one of the best helps, in the English language, to an intelligent study of the Bible, and cannot fail of deriving spiritual advantage from a proper use of it. Each of the authors of this volume, has prefixed a tolerably full Introduction to his part of the work. These Introductions embrace the usual topics discussed in Introductions to individual books of the Bible, and will be found scholarly, comprehensive and yet compact. The work as a whole, is marked by a studied conciseness, and the avoidance of useless matter, which only swells without adding to the value of such a commentary. In this particular, the authors have shown better judgment than some other commentators, who seem bent on showing how much they can drag together. We recommend this commentary to those who desire a work of the kind on the whole of the Bible.

HARPER &amp; BROTHERS, NEW YORK.

*The Mikado's Empire*. Book I., History of Japan, from 660 B. C. to 1872 A. D. Book II., Personal Experiences, Observations, and Studies in Japan, 1870—1874. By William Elliot Griffis, A. M., late of the Imperial University of Tokio, Japan. pp. 625. 1876.

Vol. VII. No. 1.

19

This is a superb volume, on a subject of great and growing interest. A few years ago Japan was a closed country against all foreigners—now it is perhaps the most open and inviting of all countries not included in the pale of Christendom. The revolution has been one of the most wonderful in the history of the world. This volume is the result of a four years residence in that strange land, and of a study of the history and life of that people. Mr. Griffis possessed good opportunities for such a work. He was invited to Japan to organize a scientific school on the principle of our American schools, and after about a year at Fukui, he was Professor for three years in the Imperial University, at Tokio. Such a position afforded advantages for the preparation of the work now before us. The volume is divided into two parts, historical, and personal. The first part, which is occupied with the history of Japan from 660 B. C. to 1872 A. D., includes about one half of the volume. This is necessarily beset with much greater difficulties than the latter part. To master in a few years the whole history of a people hitherto little known, to separate what is false from what is true, so as to arrive at certainty, on all points, may be pronounced an impossibility. All that can be claimed is, that the author has performed his task well, and has given us much valuable historical matter in regard to a people of whom we need and desire information. Further studies may reverse some opinions and change some conclusions, but they will not destroy the substantial value of this volume, as a contribution to the history of the Japanese. We may look for some correction of errors by subsequent writers. Our attention has been called to one by Prof. Parsons, in his calling the Daimos Princes. It would, however, be ungenerous to hunt after small defects and overlook substantial merits.

The second part of the volume will be most interesting to the majority of Readers. It details the personal experience and observations of the author, and gives us a view of the manners and customs, mode of living and social habits, religious practices, etc., of the people. The various chapters which treat of such topics as "Sights and sounds in a pagan temple; Life in a Japanese house; Children's games and sports; Household customs and superstitions; Folk-lore and fire-side stories; The position of woman, etc., etc., are full of interest and instruction. Some things may excite the surprise of our Christian people, as when he says :

"No ladies excel the Japanese in that innate love of beauty, order, neatness, household adornment and management, and the amenities of dress and etiquette as prescribed by their own standard. \* \* As educators of their children, the Japanese women are peers to the mothers of any civilization. \* \* The Japanese maiden is bright, intelligent, interesting, modest, lady-like, self-reliant; neither a slave nor a wanton." All this will only make us feel more sensitively, when

he adds: "I yet utter my conviction that nothing can ever renovate the individual heart, nothing purify society, and give pure blood-growth to the body politic in Japan, but the religion of Jesus Christ." The one thing still needed is the Gospel.

There are valuable notes and appendices, furnishing statistics in regard to population, finances, productions, resources of the country, the army and navy, etc., etc., with a full Index to the whole work. Altogether it is a volume such as thousands of readers will be glad to possess.

*The First Century of the Republic: A Review of American Progress.*

By the Rev. Theodore D. Woolsey, D. D., LL. D., etc. pp. 506. 1876.

The papers which make up this volume were published, most of them, during the past year, in Harper's Magazine, with the title of "The First Century of the Republic." They were written by authors of such acknowledged reputation, and on subjects of so great interest, that we are glad to have them together in this substantial volume. It is a most fitting volume for 1876. It should be in the hands of every American reader—a household volume. The subjects discussed are so varied, and the information given so extensive, that we cannot attempt any summary of its contents. The very best we can do will be to give a list of the authors and their subjects. Eugene Lawrence, Introduction—Colonial Progress; Edward H. Knight, Mechanical Progress; David A. Wells, Progress in Manufacture; William H. Brewer, Agricultural Progress; T. Sterry Hunt, The Development of our Mineral Resources; Edward Atkinson, Commercial Development; Francis G. Walker, Growth and Distribution of Population; William S. Sumner, Monetary Development; T. D. Woolsey, The Experiment of the Union; Eugene Lawrence, Educational Progress; F. A. P. Barnard, The Exact Sciences; Theodore Gill, Natural Science; Edwin P. Whipple, A Century of American Literature; S. S. Conant, Progress of the Fine Arts; Austin Flint, Medical and Sanitary Progress; Benjamin Vaughan Abbott, American Jurisprudence; Charles L. Bruce, Humanitarian Progress; John F. Hurst, Religious Development. The writers will be recognized, many of them, as representative men in their own departments. A carefully prepared analytical Index crowns the whole, and makes it a volume of convenience for reference, as well as of interest for general reading. It is hardly necessary to add that the style in which it is published is worthy of the well known house of Harper and Brothers.

*Homeric Synchronism. An Enquiry into the Time and Place of Homer.* By the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, M. P., Author of "Juventus Mundi," etc. pp. 284. 1876.

This is a volume of special interest to critical scholars. It is another, and most valuable, contribution to the Homeric question. The

authorship of the *Iliad*, and the related questions, have been matters of long and learned disputation. When we first read Homer in Greek, we were excited on the subject, and felt pained at the many critical doubts as to the reality of his existence and the authenticity of his story. We are glad to find so accomplished a scholar as Mr. Gladstone still defending the old and cherished views. His general conclusion is: "There are probable grounds, of an historical character, for believing that the main action of the *Iliad* took place, and that Homer lived, between certain chronological limits, which may now be approximately pointed out to the satisfaction of reasonable minds." The volume consists of two Parts—the first treats of the place and date of Homer in history, the second of matters relating to Homer's connection with Egyptian and Eastern knowledge. The discussion has, as the author suggests, "indirectly a relation to the Chronology of the Hebrew Records."

*Mediaeval and Modern Saints and Miracles.* Not ab uno e Societate Jesu. pp. 307. 1876.

The author of this volume has furnished, from authentic sources, copious illustrations of the teaching of the Romish Church. In this case, nothing is so terrible as the telling of the simple truth. It is not the Romanism of the dark ages, but Romanism as it has come down to our own day, that is here exposed to view, and subjected to this arraignment before the American public. The intelligent reader can examine the author ities for himself, as a large part of the volume is made up of citations from Catholic and standard authorities. The volume is one of great value on the Catholic question—which at present interests us politically as well as religiously.

*A General History of Greece.* From the earliest period to the death of Alexander the Great. With a Sketch of the subsequent History to the present time. By George W. Cox, M. A., Author of "Tales of Ancient Greece," "Mythology of the Aryan Nations," etc. pp. xxxii., 709. 1876.

We have no lack of histories of Greece, but this one is likely to secure for itself no inferior place. The author brings to his task ripe scholarship, a keen appreciation of his subject, a careful examination of facts, with manifest capacity as a writer to give a clear and impressive view of what he desires to portray. The volume is sufficiently full to satisfy the majority of readers, and yet not so full as to be tedious in its details. The style is clear, vigorous, and flowing, and many of the scenes are drawn with strong effect. It has all the requisite appendages, in the way of marginal and foot notes, colored maps, chronological table, Index, etc., to make it a complete volume for the student, and for whom it is specially designed, being one of "the Student's Series."

*A General History of Rome*, from the foundation of the city to the fall of Augustus, B. C. 753—A. D. 476. By Charles Merivale, D. D., Dean of Ely. pp. 701. 1876.

This volume, like the preceding one, to which it is a mate, belongs to "the Student's Series." It is an abridgment or condensation of the author's greater work, and the execution of the plan has been done with great judgment and skill. We are here furnished with a history that is really instructive, and at the same time sufficiently entertaining. It is supplied with maps and a good Index.

These two volumes, on Greece and Rome, are real additions to our historical reading, and will aid in a better acquaintance with these most interesting and important portions of the history of the ancient world: and will also help to a better understanding of much in our modern literature and civilization.

JOS. H. COATES & CO., PHILADELPHIA.

*Essays in Literary Criticism*. By Richard Holt Hutton.—Goethe and his Influence.—Nathaniel Hawthorne.—Arthur Hugh Clough.—Wordsworth and his Genius.—George Eliot.—Matthew Arnold. pp. 355. 1876.

Messrs. Coates & Co. deserve thanks for giving to the public an American edition of these literary papers of Mr. Hutton. It is proper that a writer who ranks among the ablest men of England in his own field, should be better known than he has been in our country, and that American readers should enjoy the pleasure and profit of a more general familiarity with his writings. Mr. Hutton is the leading Editor of the London *Spectator*, and the well-known success of that journal is largely due to his high literary ability. The six essays that form this volume—on the authors named on the title-page—present abundant evidence that he deserves to be ranked among the foremost literary critics of our day.

These papers are unusually fresh, and are marked throughout by fine discrimination, genial literary insight, just and subtle analysis, and remarkable aptness of critical expression. Mr. Hutton tells us, in his preface to this American edition, of "the constant delight he has taken in the writers here reviewed." The evidence of this intense interest in his authors, by which he reached his deep insight into them, is everywhere apparent. But his appreciation is by no means blind or unqualified. He sees defects and faults, and does not spare them. Perhaps the most distinguishing characteristic of Mr. Hutton's criticisms is the mirror-like view he gives of the personality of his authors—presenting the men as impressed on their writings. In this respect the papers of this volume are peculiarly valuable, as they show the sadly damaging influence, in the case of a number of the authors reviewed, of a want either of high moral life or of true Christian

faith. In the case of Matthew Arnold, for instance, it is made apparent how a skeptical rejection of what Heaven has provided in the Gospel for the craving needs of the human soul, has left only a brilliant intellectualism, unsatisfied and unanchored in the midst of its treasures, and has spread an aspect of sadness and gloom over all his poetry, which is well described as embodying "the sweetness, the gravity, the beauty, and the languor of death." In the case of Goethe, it is shown how the "moral indifference" theory of art breaks utterly down, and his poetry, which is almost perfect "until it rises to the dramatic region, where moral actions are involved, and a moral faith is therefore heeded, then becomes blank, shadowy, feeble." In the negative attitude, of both Hawthorne and Clough, toward Christian faith, literary ability was similarly damaged and barred from its best success. We know not precisely what theological standpoint Mr. Hutton occupies. If we mistake not, he holds "broad-church" sentiments. However that may be, the pictures he gives of some of the writers and writings he reviews, afford a very impressive view of the damaging effects, in literary effort, of skeptical thought or the absence of positive Christian faith. The moral tone of the Essays is, therefore, healthful and bracing.

BAKER, VOORHIS & CO., NEW YORK.

*The Philosophy of Law; being Notes of Lectures delivered during Twenty-three Years (1832—1875) in Inner Temple Hall, London.*  
By Herbert Broom, LL. D., late Professor on Common Law to the Inns of Court. pp. 307. 1876.

Dr. Broom is probably the best legal author, of our day, in England. His *Commentaries on Common Law*, *Commentaries on Constitutional Law*, and *Legal Maxims*, have secured for him high credit and a wide reputation. The work before us comes as the fruit of his long service as Professor of Common Law to the Inns of Court, London. Containing, as it does, the substance of his lectures in that position, it exhibits the results of long and careful thought—the maturest views and statements of one confessedly eminent in the science of jurisprudence.

The author's aim has been, not to present a theoretical view of the philosophy of law, or reach conclusions by abstract methods, but to bring out the acknowledged principles of law from the actual decisions of the courts. This method has the advantage of always connecting the broad, universal legal principle with a clear, distinct illustration of it. It brings into most transparent view the general ground and principles which underlie all right statutory regulations, and the rules and reasoning which lawyers and courts must apply to the various cases in practical life. The subject is thus brought under "the inductive method" of study, and it is made plain that, however crooked or oblivious of equity judicial processes may sometimes seem to be, juris-

prudence is yet a "rational science founded upon the universal principles of moral rectitude."

The scope of this work is probably best indicated by a glance at the subjects of the different chapters. The first chapter is prefatory, and sets forth the nature and sources of common law, and the grounds of distinction between civil and criminal law. The next four chapters discuss the subject of contracts, defining their nature and settling all the principles that are applied to them. Chapters sixth and seventh present the subject of "torts," and the various legal principles they involve. The eighth and ninth chapters take up criminal law, and discuss the nature of the various crimes, and the legal rules demanded in the application of philosophic jurisprudence to cases in court.

The work is eminently practical, and must of course prove valuable to practitioners and students of law. To citizens in general it will afford such an acquaintance with the leading principles of law as should be had by all. Ministers of the Gospel would do well to make themselves familiar with the main principles of legal science as here presented. The publishers have done their part well, issuing the volume, in octavo, on heavy, tinted paper, and in large clear type, delightful to the eye.

S. C. GRIGGS & CO., CHICAGO.

*Viking Tales of the North.* The Sagas of Thorstein, Viking's Son, and Fridthjof the Bold, Translated from the Icelandic by Rasmus B. Anderson, A. M., Professor of the Scandinavian Languages in the University of Wisconsin, and Honorary Member of the Icelandic Literary Society, and Jón Bjarnason. Also Tegnér's Fridthjof's Saga, translated into English by George Stevens. pp. 370, 1877.

Good service was done by Prof. Anderson, in the interest of Scandinavian literature among us, by his work on *Norse Mythology*, and other books. We welcome this volume, giving us several characteristic Icelandic Sagas, with the needed explanations for a right understanding of them. It is a kind of literature but little known to the American public, and deserves encouragement. We believe this is the first volume of Saga-translations ever published in this country.

The word 'Saga' is applied to the Norse tales of the olden time, whether historical or fabulous. Some of the Sagas present genuine historical traditions, others are formed largely of mythical elements. Mr. Anderson has given us an example of each kind—the Saga of Thorstein being historical, and that of Fridthjof the Bold belonging to the fabulous class. In both we see illustrated the artistic and dramatic form into which the Saga writers cast their material. These Northern tales take the reader into scenes new and strange to him—where the movement of events is determined by unlooked-for blendings of supernatural powers with human actions, and rough supersti-

tions with historical facts. The consequent wild, weird, unearthly character of some of the scenes causes the stories to get a strong hold of the reader's interest. About half of the volume is made up of Stevens' translation of Tegnér's great Swedish poem: *Fridthjof's Saga*, with introductory chapters containing a Sketch of Bishop Tegnér, etc. The two Sagas prepare the reader to understand and appreciate this famous poem, which is based upon them. The volume closes with Explanatory Notes, and a Glossary of terms needing definition.

*Fridthjof's Saga*; a Norse Romance, by Esaias Tegnér, Bishop of Wexio. Translated from the Swedish by Thomas A. E. Holcomb and Martha A. Lyon Holcomb. pp. 213. 1877.

Tegnér's *Fridthjof's Saga*, as it has been well expressed, is "the very heart of Scandinavian poetry—a heart which, though it belongs to the icy North and strikes its deepest roots far down into the traditional legends of ancestral paganism, still has enough of warmth and beauty to delight the readers of the most varied climates and nationalities." An immense number of editions of this celebrated poem have been published in Sweden and Norway, and it has been reproduced in all the languages of Europe. Eighteen translations into English have preceded the one now given by Mr. and Mrs. Holcomb, which is the first *American* translation. We welcome this new rendering, not only because it is *American*, but because of its high excellence. It exhibits the true poetic susceptibility needed in a translator, to transfer poetry from one tongue to another. It is marked by an easy, graceful, musical flow of the metres,—preserving in every canto the original measures,—that makes this a truly superior translation. The volume is beautifully gotten out by the enterprising publishers.

*The Great Conversers, and other Essays*. By William Mathews, LL. D., Prof. of Rhetoric and English Literature in the University of Chicago. Sixth Edition, pp. 304. 1876.

It is not surprising that this book has reached a sixth edition. It is made up of twenty brief essays on important or interesting topics, and sparkles all through with gems of thought, beautiful expression and useful truths. Dr. Mathews exhibits much literary wealth, and writes with great force. Valuable lessons are given in a way that entertains and charms the reader. The author has one fault, however, which somewhat mars the excellence of some of his essays—the habit of allowing an error or mistake which he combats to throw him into an opposite extreme in which proper limitations are forgotten. His representations are often exaggerations, and his antitheses become unjust and misleading. An illustration of this is afforded by the essay on Compulsory Morality, in which, from the impotence of law to create personal virtue, he swings over to a conclusion which, logi-

eally extended and applied, amounts to an absurd denial of the propriety and usefulness of all legal restriction of crime or offences against social welfare. But even where the reader cannot accept all Dr. Mathew's views or statements, he will be quickened and instructed by his rich and unfailing suggestiveness.

SCRIBNER, ARMSTRONG & CO., NEW YORK.

*Christian Dogmatics*: A Text-Book for Academical Instruction and Private Study. By J. J. Van Oosterzee, D. D., Professor of Theology in the University of Utrecht. Translated from the Dutch, By J. W. Watson, B. A., Vicar of Newburgh, Lancashire; and Maurice J. Evans, B. A., Stratford-upon-Avon. vols. I, & II. pp. 818.

This work is issued as part of the "*Theological and Philosophical Library*," edited by Drs. Smith and Schaff. They have selected it "as being upon the whole the work best adapted to the wants of English and American students." The wisdom of their selection we are not disposed to discuss, but to confine ourselves to the work selected. That it possesses real merit and is entitled to a conspicuous place among works which treat of Christian Dogmatics, few competent to form a candid and intelligent judgment, will deny. It is systematic in arrangement, comprehensive in scope, scholarly in discussion, orthodox, according to the Reformed standards, in doctrine, but catholic in spirit, and evangelical in sentiment. It makes good its title to *Christian Dogmatics*, for whilst the author does not discard the proper use of reason and philosophy, he does not forget that here, "everything must be viewed by the light which streams forth from Christ as centre;" and that, "Christ as the highest revelation of God, must also be to the dogmatist the light of his science."

It was perhaps a misfortune for the success of this work, in the United States, that it followed so close upon the elaborate work of Dr. Hodge, of the same general school of Theology, and with which it is most naturally brought into comparison. Dr. Hodge's Systematic Theology, published by the same house, Scribner, Armstrong & Co., had, we believe, a large sale, both in this country, and in England and Scotland. The field was thus to some extent preoccupied, and the work of Dr. Oosterzee will have fewer purchasers and students than if it had appeared in more propitious times. Still, it will doubtless command a steady and continuous sale.

Compared with the Systematic Theology of Dr. Hodge, we should say that it is more systematic and scientific in its treatment of the general subject, and has less of irrelevant or outside discussions. Many incidental topics, discussed at considerable length by Dr. Hodge, are barely alluded to by Dr. Oosterzee. Dr. Hodge's work impresses us as a careful compilation made upon an original outline, and hence

has much that scarcely belongs to a treatise on Systematic Theology. It is all very valuable, but some of it would be more in place elsewhere. Dr. Oosterzee has adhered to a plan, and given us an elaborate work, the result more of his own thinking and composition. His reference to other authors are quite frequent, but he quotes much less than Dr. Hodge. He is also less positive and dogmatic than the venerable Princeton Theologian. Tenaciously holding to the Reformed faith, he nevertheless does not seem so certain of its infallibility in every particular as Dr. Hodge does. On various points, such as that of the theistic argument, inspiration, etc., his views are rather European than English or American. He has evidently felt more the influence of other schools of theology and philosophy, than we have on this side of the ocean. He shows less disposition to contend for the formulae of the orthodox faith, than to set it forth in a manner that may commend itself to the sober thought of the present age. It is not meant that the work shows any material departure from what are considered orthodox views, but a more free handling of them than has commonly prevailed. There is no apparent unwillingness to grapple with any of the grave questions which belong to such a work.

It is eminently candid and fair in the discussion of topics about which there are real differences of opinion. The author does not fail to express, on every suitable occasion, his advocacy of the Reformed doctrine when differing from the Lutheran, yet he seldom if at all does any injustice to Lutheran views, unless it be that they are not always fully presented. It is to be distinctly understood, and he makes no attempt to conceal the fact, that he belongs to the Reformed School of Theology. But it is not the old, crabbed, repulsive exhibition of it. It is Calvinism in its modern dress, if still the same in substance, yet sweetened in spirit and more attractive in appearance. As illustrating Dr. Oosterzee's disposition to make concessions to others, he has really conceded nearly all that Baptists ask, and leaves a very slender support for his own system. We believe he has conceded more than the facts in the case warrant.

We would be glad to notice more at length some other features of the work, but we are hindered by lack of space. For the purpose designed, we regard it as a very excellent treatise, and, bating the few points on which we cannot agree with the author, cordially commend it to our readers. It is a valuable acquisition to the library of any minister or theological student.

(Through J. B. Lippincott & Co., Phila.)

*The Book of the Prophet Ezekiel.* By Fr. Wilhelm Julius Schroeder, B. D., Translated, enlarged, and edited By Patrick Fairbairn, D.D., and Rev. William Findlay, M. A., Larkhall, Scotland, aided by Rev. Thomas Crerar, M. A., and Rev. Sinclair Manson, M. A. pp. 492.

*The Book of the Prophet Daniel*—By Dr. Otto Zöckler. Translated, enlarged and edited, By James Strong, S. T. D., Professor of Exegetical Theology in Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, N. J. pp. 273. 1876.

This is the thirteenth volume of Lange's Commentary on the Old Testament. That on the New Testament is completed, and the Old Testament part is rapidly approaching completion. Its general character is so well known, that little more seems necessary than to announce to our readers the appearance of this another volume. It may be added that the work of preparation, both in the original and in the edition in English, has fallen into the most competent hands, giving assurance of being well done. It is a volume covering prophecies of special interest.

*Epochs of Modern History. The Early Plantagenets.* By William Stubbs, M. A., Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Oxford. pp. 308.

*Epochs in Ancient History. Roman History. The Early Empire.* From the assassination of Julius Caesar to that of Domitian, by W. W. Capes, M. A., Late Fellow and Tutor of Queen's College and reader in Ancient History in the University of Oxford. pp. 260.

*The Athenian Empire*, by Geo. W. Cox, M. A., Joint-Editor of the Series. pp. 275.

The first of these three volumes belongs to the Series of Histories of Modern Epochs, the other two to that of Ancient Epochs. The first Series has now reached the ninth volume, the other the third. These volumes cover epochs of the deepest interest and greatest importance in the history of the world. They are prepared by scholars, who have made the subject a special study. We commend them to our readers for their real worth as histories, their convenience in studying special periods, and their attractiveness in style and cheapness in price.

*Sans-Souci Series. Anecdote Biography of Percy Bysshe Shelley.* Edited by Richard Henry Stoddard. pp. xxii. 290. 1877.

This is in every sense a most attractive volume. The exterior is pleasing to the eye, and the interior is still more pleasing, or rather fascinating. The subject is one of strange and absorbing interest, and Mr. Stoddard has performed his part so as to leave no room for fault-finding criticism. We scarcely know how more could be compressed into narrower space, or presented in a cheaper or more attractive form. If this is a fair specimen of this new series, it may be safe to predict for it great popularity, and the enterprising publishers may congratulate themselves on an assured success.

ROBERT CARTER & BROS., NEW YORK.

Through Smith, English & Co., Phila.

*The Footprints of St. Peter:* Being the Life and Times of the Apostle. By J. R. Macduff, D. D., Author of "the Footprints of St. Paul," "Memories of Gennesaret," "Morning and Night Watches," etc., etc. pp. xvi., 630. 1877.

The popular writer in this new work gives us a full account of the great apostle of the circumcision, from his early infancy to his death and burial. He aims to be full and satisfactory on all leading incidents, and to allow nothing to pass unnoticed that would throw light on his subject. In some instances there seems to be a needless minuteness of detail, yet the volume is one of value both for scholars and general readers. It will supply a want in our religious literature.

*History of the Reformation in Europe in the Time of Calvin.* By the Rev. J. H. Merle D'Aubigne, D. D., translated by William L. R. Cates. pp. xxix., 576. 1876.

D'Aubigne's History of the Reformation has been too widely read, and is too well known to need any extended notice. This is the seventh volume, and, like the preceding one, treats especially of the time of Calvin, who, as is well known was the object of the author's greatest admiration. Although posthumous, it possesses the well known traits of the distinguished writer. Another volume, expected during the year, will complete the work. It must always remain, in spite of historical defects, a popular history of the great Reformation.

*Synoptical Lectures on the Books of Holy Scripture.* Third Series. Romans—Revelation. By the Rev. Donald Fraser, D. D. pp. 306.

The plan of these Lectures is somewhat novel and well executed. The author condenses a great deal in a very narrow compass, and furnishes in a popular form and style the results of careful critical study. No one can read these lectures without a more intelligent view of the books of which they treat. They offer suggestions in the way of exposition—which it would be well for pastors to improve.

*Uncle Joe's Thanksgiving.* By Julia A. Mathews, author of "The Golden Ladder Series," "Drayton Hall," "Dare to Do Right," etc. pp. 360. 1877.

*The Broken Mallet, and the Pigeon's Eggs.* By Jonanna H. Mathews, author of "the Bessie Books," etc. pp. 325. 1877.

Two volumes by these popular writers for the young.

JAMES R. OSGOOD & CO., BOSTON.

(Through J. B. Lippincott & Co.)

*In the Levant.* By Charles Dudley Warren, author of "My Summer in a Garden;" "My Winter on the Nile," etc., etc. pp. 374. 1877.

This is a very interesting volume of travel and sight-seeing. The author, who was already known by a number of popular volumes, takes us over some of the most attractive places in the old world, and using his eyes for our benefit, tells us, in a chatty style, what he sees and learns. It brings one right into the midst of the life which the volume intends to portray. The journey begins at Jaffa, the ancient Joppa, and proceeds thence to Jerusalem, including the holy places in and around the city, with the "going down to Jericho," and Bethlehem. We are carried along the Syrian coast, over the Lebanon to Baalbeck and Damascus, of which very interesting accounts are given. Cyprus and Rhodes and the Ægean isles, Smyrna and Ephesus, Constantinople, Athens and Corinth are included in the range of places visited and talked about. It is enough to name the places visited to satisfy any one that the subject of the volume need not lack interest, and the author makes good use of his eyes and ears, and wields a ready pen.

*Harold. A Drama* by Alfred Tennyson. [Author's edition, from advance sheets.] pp. 170. 1877.

It is enough to announce a new poem from Tennyson to insure readers; and the volume comes too late for any careful notice in this number of the REVIEW. The characters who figure in the play are the most distinguished in that epoch of England's history—King Edward the Confessor, Stigand, Archbishop of Canterbury, and Aldred, Archbishop of York, Count William of Normandy, William Rufus, the sons of Earl Godwin, of whom Harold, the Hero of the Drama, is the most conspicuous. The volume is published uniform with "Queen Mary," and is attractive in appearance.

SMITH, ENGLISH & CO., PHILADELPHIA.

*Text-Book of Church History.* By Dr. John Henry Kurtz, Professor of Theology in the University of Dorpat, etc. Two vols. in one. Revised, with Corrections and Additions from the Seventh German Edition. pp. 534. 1876.

This new edition of this popular text-book of Church History differs from the preceding chiefly in a more accurate representation of some of the Churches in the United States—especially the Lutheran. It has received, and merits, a wide use in Theological Seminaries and in private study. The publishers deserve well of all who have occasion to use such a work, in their efforts to render it more accurate and trustworthy. The movements of Churches in the United States are so rapid and varied, that it is not easy to keep pace with the changes.

LUTHERAN BOOK STORE, 117 N. SIXTH ST., PHILA.

*Luther and the Swiss.* A Lecture delivered before the Evangelical Association of Hanover, Germany. By Gerhard Uhlhorn, D. D.

Translated from the German by G. F. Krotel, D. D., Pastor of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of the Holy Trinity, New York city. pp. 57. 1876.

We intended to give some extracts from this able and interesting Lecture, but are unable for want of room. It is decidedly Lutheran, but not quite according to "the Galesburg Rule." We commend its careful reading by all.

---

*Lecture Notes on Inorganic Chemistry.* By E. S. Breidenbaugh, A. M., Conrad Professor of Chemistry and Mineralogy, Pennsylvania College. pp. 71. 1876.

These Notes are designed for the use of students in the study of chemistry, and to save the time occupied in taking and transcribing notes of lectures. They will be found very convenient, and, being interleaved with excellent white paper, furnish room for any additional notes of students. Printed by J. E. Wible, Gettysburg, Pa.

The several Lutheran Almanacs, as usual, have been published. They differ somewhat in figures and names. Greater accuracy, if possible, is desired in the statistics of the Church. These Almanacs furnish a large amount of valuable information in regard to the Church, and shoud have a wide circulation. No Lutheran family should be without one of them. We have been brought to regard them as a necessity, and would sooner be without some costly volume than a Lutheran Almanac. We give the names of these publications.

*The Lutheran Almanac, for 1877.* By T. Newton Kurtz, 151 W. Pratt St. Baltimore, Md. pp. 48.

*Kirchenfreund Kalendar auf das Jahr unseres Herrn, 1877.* Ein jahrbuch des "Lutherischen Kirchenfreundes" für das deutsche Christenvolk. By Severinghaus & Co., 375 Milwaukee St., Chicago, Ill. pp. 46.

*Church Almanac, 1877.* Lutheran Book Store, 117 N. 6th St. Phila. pp. 46.

We have received several Memorial Discourses. "Our History and our Success," by Dr. L. A. Gotwald, York, Pa.; "Centennial Memorial," by Rev. L. M. Heilman, Harrisburg, Pa.; "Centennial Discourse," by R. B. Welch, D. D., LL. D., of Union College, N. Y.

"Report of the American Evangelical Lutheran Mission in India; with a brief sketch of the Mission. 1876.

## CONTENTS OF NO. I.

Article.	Page.
I. BISHOP BUTLER AND HIS SERMONS,.....	1
By Rev. C. A. STORK, D. D., Baltimore, Md.	
II. THE DENIAL OF THE CUP,.....	29
By Rev. V. BOTH, Mobile, Alabama.	
III. SEMI-CENTENNIAL NECROLOGICAL ADDRESS,.....	42
By Rev. R. WEISER, D. D., of Georgetown, Colorado.	
IV. THE ORGANIC STRUCTURE AND PREROGATIVES OF PRIMITIVE AND APOSTOLIC CHURCHES,.....	54
B. Rev. N. VAN ALSTINE, Raymertown, N. Y.	
V. OUR PRESENT KNOWLEDGE OF THE SUN,.....	67
By Rev. PHILIP M. BIKLE, A. M., Professor of Physics and Astro- nomy in Pennsylvania College, Gettysburg, Pa.	
VI. CONFESSION,.....	81
By Rev. FRANCIS SPRINGER, D. D., Hillsboro, Ill.	
VII. THE ORIGIN OF LIFE, OR THE GERM THEORY,.....	90
By E. S. BREIDENBAUGH, A. M., Conrad Professor of Chemistry and Mineralogy in Pennsylvania College.	
VIII. THE MISSION OF THE CHURCH, .....	100
By Rev. P. FELTS, D. D., Johnstown, N. Y.	
IX. LUTHERAN CHURCH POLITY,.....	119

## X. LITERARY INTELLIGENCE,..... 141

AMERICAN.—Biblical and Theological—Philosophical and Scientific—

Political—Historical and Biographical—Poetry—Miscellaneous.

GERMAN.—Biblical—Systematic—Historical—Miscellaneous

## XI. NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS,..... 145

A Commentary on the Old and New Testaments—The Mikado's Empire—The First Century of the Republic—Homeric Synchronism—Mediaeval and Modern Saints and Miracles—A General History of Greece—A General History of Rome—Essays in Literary Criticism—The Philosophy of Law—Viking Tales of the North—Fridthjof's Saga—The Great Conversers, and other Essays—Christian Dogmatics—The Book of the Prophet Ezekiel—The Book of the Prophet Daniel—Epochs of Modern History—The Athenian Empire—Sans-Souci Series—The Footprints of St. Peter—History of the Reformation in Europe in the Time of Calvin—Synoptical Lectures on the Books of Holy Scripture—Uncle Joe's Thanksgiving—The Broken Mallet, and the Pigeon's Egg's—In the Levant—Harold—Text-Book of Church History—Luther and the Swiss—Lecture Notes on Inorganic Chemistry—The Lutherans Almanacs for 1877.

## THE FOREIGN QUARTERLIES AND BLACKWOOD.

The contents of the Foreign Quarterlies for 1876 give striking proof that these periodicals present the opinions and thoughts of leading minds upon current and all-absorbing topics. We find E. A. Freeman, the historian, writing on "The Turks in Europe," Mr. Gladstone reviewing the "Life and Letters of Macaulay," Colonel Chesney criticising the "Comte de Paris' Campaign on the Potomac," and Lord Houghton discussing the Social Relations of England and America. Various articles on Servia and the Ottoman Empire give information on the existing European Complication. "Cycles in Trade," "The Depreciation of Silver," "Foreign Loans and National Debts," have a bearing on the present business troubles. "The Centennial" also comes in for a notice, and "The Arctic Regions" and the "Suez Canal," and many other interesting and more or less prominent topics are ably and comprehensively treated. And the far-famed Blackwood's Magazine, the most powerful monthly in the English language, abounds in stories, essays, and sketches, of the highest literary merit.